Investigating the Relationship of EFL Learners' Willingness to Communicate and Learner Identity - A Case Study

Mari Hakala
682320S Master's Thesis
English Philology
Faculty of Humanities
University of Oulu
Spring 2019

Abstract

Interaction and communication have received remarkable attention within SLA research in recent years. The sociocultural learning approach implemented in Finnish comprehensive schools through the national curriculum also emphasises interaction and communication as key concepts in all learning. Thus, this qualitative, empirical case study investigates what role van Lier's Interaction Types (1988) have in EFL learners' willingness to communicate (WTC) in the language of the lesson, as well as EFL learners' WTC in relation to the learners' identities. The latter will be studied applying Zimmerman's identity categories (1998). The participants of this study were two groups of 9th-graders in a Finnish comprehensive school, and the data was collected during two, 75-minute English as a Foreign Language (EFL) lessons using non-participatory observation. The analysis showed that WTC varies depending on the interaction type, but also that a variety of situational aspects within these categories, such as access to vocabulary in the second language and problematic situations, influence learners' WTC. In addition, the analysis showed that when learners identify themselves as pupils, they show WTC in the language of the lesson, whereas if the learners communicate as themselves, they show WTC in their first language. It appears that the pupils' selves are thus separate from their pupil and language learner identities. Possible practical implications stemming from this are encouraging the pupils to use English as themselves, with the language skills they have, but also providing them with appropriate tools to practice the language, such as providing access to appropriate vocabulary and giving enough time to prepare for tasks to come.

Keywords: *English as a foreign language, willingness to communicate, interaction types, learner identity, imagined communities, education*

Abstrakti

Vuorovaikutus ja kommunikaatio ovat saaneet merkittävää huomiota toisen kielen oppimista tutkivilla tieteenaloilla. Osana valtakunnallista opetussuunnitelmaa Suomen peruskouluissa noudatetaan sosiokulttuurista oppimiskäsitystä, joka painottaa vuorovaikutuksen ja kommunikoinnin merkitystä oppimisessa. Tämä laadullinen, empiirinen tapaustutkimus tutkiikin englantia vieraana kielenä opiskelevien oppilaiden kielenkäyttöä oppitunneilla, erityisesti sitä, minkälainen yhteys on oppilaiden halukkuudella kommunikoida oppitunnin kielellä (WTC) ja van Lierin vuorovaikutustyypeillä (1988). Tämän lisäksi tutkimus pyrkii Zimmermanin identiteettityyppejä (1998) hyödyntämällä selvittämään, onko oppilaiden muuttuvilla identiteeteillä yhteys heidän halukkuuteensa kommunikoida. Tutkimukseen osallistui kaksi yhdeksäsluokkalaista ryhmää Suomalaisesta peruskoulusta, ja tutkimusaineisto kerättiin kahden 75-minuuttisen englanninkielen oppitunnin aikana havainnoimalla, osallistumatta oppitunnin kulkuun. Analyysissa ilmeni, että oppilaiden halukkuus kommunikoida vaihteli riippuen vuorovaikutustyypistä. Vuorovaikutustyyppien sisällä ilmeni lisäksi tekijöitä, kuten sanalistan käyttö ja ongelmalliset tilanteet, jotka vaikuttivat kommunikointikieleen. Tämän lisäksi havaittiin, että oppilaat osoittivat halukkuutta kommunikoida tunnin kielellä, jos he identifioivat itsensä oppilaiksi, kun taas kommunikoidessaan omina itsenään oppilaat kommunikoivat äidinkielellään. Vaikuttaa siis siltä, että oppilaiden minä on erillään heidän oppilas- ja kielenoppijan identiteeteistään. Mahdollisia käytännön seuraamuksia tästä on rohkaista oppilaita käyttämään englannin kieltä omina itsenään hyödyntäen juuri sitä kielitasoa, joka heillä on, sekä tarjota heille sopivat välineet kielen harjoittamiseen. Tällaisia välineitä tämän tutkimuksen perusteella ovat esimerkiksi sopivien sanalistojen tarjoaminen oppilaiden käyttöön sekä riittävä aika valmistautua tuleviin aktiviteetteihin.

Avainsanat: *englanti vieraana kielenä, kommunikointihalukkuus, interaktiotyypit, oppijan identiteetti, kuvitellut yhteisöt, koulutus*

Table of contents

1. Introduction

Communication and interaction have recently been believed to be important contributors to successful second language acquisition (Bernales, 2016; Pawlak & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, 2015; Macintyre et al., 1998). Authentic communication and interaction in the language (a second or third, i.e. foreign language; FL) are regarded as crucial aspects within second language acquisition research, and they are thus believed to be a significant part of language learning and teaching (Pawlak & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, 2015). Indeed, stemming from the belief that interaction and communication are in key role in second language acquisition, the field has now been discussing a concept that emerged in the 1980's as a concept aiming to explain and unravel L2 communication, namely Willingness to Communicate (WTC) (Bernales, 2016; Macintyre et al., 1998). WTC is a relatively new area in the study of second language acquisition. It has not yet been studied extensively, and more research is required in order to fully understand the role of the concept in regard to L2 learning and acquisition (see e.g. Bernales, 2016; Pawlak & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, 2015). This is what this present study contributes to.

Authentic communication and interaction have also been at the heart of the sociocultural learning theory (Opetushallitus, 2014: Vygotsky, 1978, 1962). Under the recent years, it has received remarkable attention within the field of second language learning and has been advocated in many schools, the Finnish comprehensive schools included (Opetushallitus, 2014). The sociocultural learning approach has been in use in Finnish schools for decades, but particularly through the implementation of the updated National Curriculum for Basic Education in 2016, the approach has gained more momentum (Opetushallitus, 2014). The updated curriculum emphasises pupils' possibility to engage in activities in an appropriate, natural and meaningful language, considering the pupils' own interests (Opetushallitus, 2014, p. 350). The notions of sociocultural learning emphasised in the National Curriculum for Basic Education (2014) stem from, among others, van Lier, who emphasises that (1) language arises from "semiotic activity", (2) language cannot be transmitted via monologue or dialogue bridging an information gap, but emerges through learners' joint attention occurring in cooperation (or in van Lier's words, in "triadic interaction"), (3) affordances support one's language learning, and (4) the quality of linguistic activities in the classroom play a crucial role in language learning (van Lier, 2002, p. 146). From aspects number (1) and (2) arise the notions of pupils' engagement in activities in the language classroom (rather than engagement in mere dialogues between the teacher and the student, for instance), notions of which are at the heart of the sociocultural learning approach advocated in Finnish schools (Opetushallitus, 2014). From aspects number (3) and (4) arise the notions of meaningful and

authentic learning environments, aspects that are similarly emphasised in the Finnish national curriculum (Opetushallitus, 2014). This means that schools in Finland are to provide the pupils, i.e. the language learners, with tools to communicate and interact appropriately and authentically in the language of the lesson in meaningful communicative activities, both within the classroom and outside in the real world.

Communication and participation thus become crucial concepts also in the Finnish language learning scenery and EFL classrooms. As the present study aims to discover how pupils in the EFL classes in Finland communicate in the second language and what role their identities may have in the decision whether or not to communicate, it seems appropriate that the concept of WTC will be applied. As discussed, WTC has not yet been extensively studied, and the present study aims to contribute to the knowledge and theory behind the concept as well as to comprehend the complex phenomenon regarding language use.

The reason to study WTC in the context of the Finnish comprehensive school is that during my teacher practice in 2017, I noticed that some pupils reply in their mother tongue (L1) even when the teacher asked a question in the target language of the lesson (English) and even if a response in the target language was perhaps expected. I became interested in the phenomenon and wanted to discover when the pupils reply in the target language and when not, and what the possible reasons behind these decisions are. After discovering the concept of Willingness to Communicate (WTC), the purpose of this paper evolved into investigating whether and how the pupils show either willingness to communicate in the target language or willingness to communicate in the L1. In addition, as discussed above, the reason why WTC is particularly important here is that it is very new as a concept; it was first used in SLA research in the 1980' (Bernales, 2016; Macintyre et al., 1998) and has not yet been extensively researched. Therefore, it is important that WTC also be studied in the field, i.e. in everyday settings in actual language classes. This paper aims to shed light on the practical aspects of the concept that is relatively new and limited in practical knowledge.

Another reason to study WTC in the Finnish schools is that I feel that my practical knowledge gathered during the theoretical studies at the university is still rather limited, particularly regarding practical knowledge on phenomena such as pupils' decision (not) to communicate in the target language classes. I wished to gain deeper understanding of the practical reasons of why pupils may be willing to reply in the target language, and decided to investigate WTC in the field to gain practical knowledge that I could later utilise in my own work as an EFL teacher. Therefore, it seemed appropriate that this paper should study WTC from different perspectives. This also explains why a limited set of data was selected for this paper.

This aim of this qualitative case study is twofold. Firstly, the study investigates English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners' Willingness to Communicate (WTC) in the target language during two 75-minute English lessons. WTC will be analysed through van Lier's (1988) Interaction Types. The first part of the analysis thus consists of the exploration of the relationship between Interaction Types and WTC, and the analysis will be based on the observable, empirical data.

Secondly, the study aims to explore the relationship between learners' WTC and their changing identities. The analysis thus seeks to explain learners' WTC in relation to the learners' identities. The analysis consists of the researcher's own interpretations of the results of the empirical data presented in the first part of the analysis, and is based on the current understanding of the theory of identities and its relation to language learning. The latest theoretical understandings of identity and language learning will thus be connected to the findings of visible WTC presented in the first part. The last part of the paper (section 5) is dedicated to discussing the results as well as providing a few practical solutions for language teachers to encourage more L2 use in the classroom.

In summary, the present study consists of two parts, the first part aiming to:

> *(1) discover what role Interaction Types have in EFL learners' WTC in the target language,*

and the second part aiming to:

> *(2) tentatively suggest reasons behind EFL pupils' WTC in the target language by analysing learners' changing identities.*

The data was gathered in November 2018 in a Finnish upper-level comprehensive school by observing one class of 23 pupils and another class of 20 pupils. All pupils were 9th-graders, and the observed lessons were for two different groups, lasting 75 minutes each. Two classes rather three or four different classes were studied because this paper is wishes to gain a more wholistic picture of communicating in a language. For the purposes of this paper, then, it is sufficient to study only a limited set of pupils (here two different classes) thoroughly, as studying a small set of pupils allows for a more in-depth analysis of WTC and how it relates to learner identities.

Although I acknowledge the conceptual difference between the concepts of target language and second language, target language and second language are in this paper used as synonyms. The conceptual difference is of no particular relevance here, as language and language learning are in this paper regarded as complex, dynamic systems affected by various social, contextual and situational aspects rather than linear phenomena in which learning is a straightforward line

resembling a monologue or dialogue in which the teacher transmits their knowledge to the learner. Therefore, this paper regards language learning along the notions provided by e.g. van Lier (2002). The concepts of target language and second language are used mechanically to signify the difference between the participants' first language and the language studied. Moreover, I primarily use the term *second language (L2)*, even though English is not studied as a second language in Finland but as a foreign, often the third language (Opetushallitus, 2014). The term L2 is nevertheless used here, and, as stated above, it will serve a mechanical purpose of separating the pupils' mutual first language (Finnish) from the language that is studied in the classroom (English). I will also use the term *native* or *native speaker*, and with that I mean someone whose first language is English.

Another aspect to consider is that of WTC. The concept *Willingness to Communicate* is relatively new and, as discussed above, research on the field is needed in order to fully comprehend the implications of the concept. However, I see a contradiction between the term *willingness* and the way language learning is regarded in this paper. If a learner decides to communicate, the decision is the product of a myriad of social, contextual and situational aspects, and by no means is it a straightforward line from the chance to communicate to communication, and by no means do I see that *willingness* is the sole deciding factor leading to communication. The same applies in the case where the learner decides not to communicate. If a possibility to communicate arises, the learner's decision not to communicate may be affected by not only his/her willingness to communicate but also by other aspects such as peer pressure, embarrassment or lack of confidence in vocabulary or pronunciation. These individual aspects may eventually make the learner unwilling to communicate, but important here is to note that behind the learner's *willingness* or *unwillingness* to communicate may lie a number of different reasons. Thus, in summary, I do not indicate that language learning and the decision to communicate is a simple matter in which the learner is either willing or unwilling to communicate, even though I use the term *willingness to communicate* (WTC). I will return to the issue later in section 5.

In this paper, I will first present the theoretical framework and relevant background theory on which this paper relies (in section 2). After that I will discuss the methods of collecting and analysing data (section 3), and then the process of analysis (section 4). Lastly, the findings as well as future work will be discussed (section 5).

2. Background and Theory

In this section, the theoretical framework applied in this paper will be introduced. Analysis of the data in this paper will be drawn upon some key aspects and concepts within research in learners' target language use in second language classrooms and within language learning. Within the language learning field, a number of recent studies have concerned themselves with classroom interaction and participation and the varying reasons behind language learners' willingness and/or unwillingness to participate in classroom interaction in the target language (see e.g. Bernales, 2016; Pawlak & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, 2015; Macintyre, 2007). As the concepts of communication and interaction are in the centre of this paper, the study will benefit from the notions of *Interaction Types* (van Lier, 1988) as well as *Willingness to Communicate* (Macintyre et al., 1998). The concept of WTC is, by nature, closely related to interaction and communication, and, thus, to sociocultural learning, and it will serve as the theoretical framework on which this study relies.

As the aim of this study is to broaden my understanding of the complex system of language learning and use from the perspective of learners' willingness to communicate, I will also discuss the relationship between learners' *identities* and the language, indeed to strengthen my understanding of what language learning in the classroom is and what role the different social and contextual aspects may have regarding the individual's decision (or willingness) to communicate in the language of the lesson (L2). To do this, I will discuss the role of learner's identities in the decision (not) to communicate in the L2. Thus, the analysis in section 4 will be conducted applying both Zimmerman's three identity categories (1998) as well as Norton and Toohey's notions of learners' changing identities (2011).

In order to situate the present study in the context of Finnish comprehensive schools, the general landscape of how learning (and thus language learning) is seen in the Finnish comprehensive schools will be presented first. I will then discuss the central theoretical concepts of this paper; that is, Willingness to Communicate, van Lier's Interaction Types (through which WTC will be analysed) and current understanding of the role of learners' identities in language learning will be presented.

2.1. The National Curriculum for Basic Education and Communication

In order to tie the general discussion of SLA as well as language learning from the WTC point of view to how language learning is regarded in Finland, discussion on the Finnish National Core Curriculum for Basic Education and its practical implications on language classrooms will be

provided here. In Finland, an updated national curriculum has been in use in schools since 2016 ("Perusopetus", n.d.), making the practical implementations in classrooms rather new.

In relation to the means to communicate in English language classrooms, the National Curriculum for Basic Education (2014) emphasises pair and group work as well as pupils learning together, similar to the methods preferred in the sociocultural approach (Opetushallitus, 2014; van Lier, 2002; Vygotsky, 1962). The aim of the language education in Finland is to provide pupils with a possibility to engage in activities in an appropriate, natural and meaningful language, considering the pupils' own interests (Opetushallitus, 2014, p. 350). This means that schools in Finland are to provide the pupils, i.e. the language learners, with tools to communicate and interact appropriately in the target language in meaningful communicative activities, both within the classroom and outside in the real world. Thus, communication and participation become crucial concepts also in the Finnish language learning scenery and EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classrooms. Interaction and communication are, in fact, essential in the new curriculum, as it encourages Finnish comprehensive schools to apply sociocultural learning theory in teaching (van Lier, 2002; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Vygotsky, 1962). Sociocultural learning approach will be discussed below.

2.2. Sociocultural Learning

In the sociocultural learning framework, the individual pupil is not seen as the centre of learning, nor is the teacher the channel that transfers knowledge to the individual learner. Instead, in the centre of sociocultural learning are individuals interacting, communicating and thus learning as members of social groups and societies. (Opetushallitus, 2010; van Lier, 2002; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Vygotsky, 1962) In addition, according to sociocultural approach, (language) learning is a process in which the pupils gradually develop their own thinking individually as well as through interactions with other members of these different groups (Opetushallitus, 2010). In the heart of sociocultural learning lies Vygotsky's (1962) notions of social environments influencing individuals' learning; according to Vygotsky, learning happens when individuals interact and communicate with each other (1962). Thus, the learner's interactions and classroom participation with peers, teachers and other professionals as well as interactions and participation within the learning environment become crucial in Finnish EFL classrooms. Furthermore, the notions WTC (further elaborated below) become equally important, as not only does it essentially relate to the sociocultural learning theory advocated and implemented in Finnish schools, but it may also provide a new aspect to consider of the sociocultural approach in which interaction is a key element.

In this paper, language learning is seen as a complex system affected by a variety of social, contextual and situational aspects. Agreeing with the sociocultural learning approach, this paper considers language learning a dynamic, multi-faceted process in which language learners interact with each other (van Lier, 2002; Vygotsky, 1962). Language learning is not seen as a process in which two separate languages are positioned as the ending points, e.g. the mother tongue and the target language that is often compared to the language of those who speak the L2 as first language (Faez, 2011; Norton & Toohey, 2011; Firth & Wagner, 1997). Furthermore, the paper does not suggest that the goal of language classes is to aim to language use that resembles native speaker use. That would emphasise that the native speaker and the language learner are at different ends of a continuum, and what separates these two from each other are the mistakes that the learner makes in pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary and so forth compared to that who speaks the language as the first language. This kind of thinking is in contradiction with the fact that even native speakers of a language make mistakes, indeed in pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary (Faez, 2011; Firth & Wagner, 1997). Instead, this paper discusses language learning from the sociocultural point of view which aligns with post-structuralist views, according to which language learners' identities are changing and shifting and may have a role in the language learning process.

Closely related to the notions of sociocultural learning as well as language learning and identity are Lave and Wenger's (1991) notions of legitimate peripheral participation (LPP). According to Lave and Wenger, people learn to become a member of a community in interaction with each other. More specifically, the person who is learning a language and wishes to become a language user, i.e. is a newcomer to the community but wishes to become a member of the language user community, gradually learns the practices, habits and values of the community and eventually becomes a member of that community (here, language users), by observing the practices but by receiving assistance from the experts. The theory suggests that the newcomer's growth into the practices of the community increase if the newcomer has direct access (can for example directly observe) the practices of those who already are members of that community (i.e. experts; language users such as teachers). (Lave & Wenger, 1991) Firstly, this connects to the sociocultural learning approach in so that according to both approaches, newcomers or (language) learners learn in interaction with others. Secondly, LPP relates to the notions of imagined communities and investment (Norton & Toohey, 2011; Kanno & Norton, 2010; see also section 2.5.) in so that in cases where no expert assistance, i.e. no language user or native language user assistance, is present or available, the imagined connection to those communities (that the native would represent) may serve as the imagined expert assistance for the pupil. When imagining belonging to the certain community, the

pupil may potentially find him-/herself investing more on the language learning in comparison to the situation in which there is no imagined community.

2.3. Willingness to Communicate (WTC)

As to the concept and its origins, WTC initially emerged in literature concerning first language (L1) communication. As Macintyre, Dörnyei, Clément and Noels (1998) explain, the original definition of 'willingness to communicate' was described as "the probability of engaging in communication when free to choose to do so", i.e. it was first and foremost regarded as a personality trait through learners' L1 (p. 546). This was in contrast with the way Macintyre et al. saw WTC in L2, as they regarded the concept as a variable depending on the situation and context, affected by varying linguistic, communicative and social aspects. They also thought that the notions of WTC in L1 were not directly applicable to WTC in learner's second language (L2). These aspects led Macintyre and his research group to present a conceptual model of WTC in L2, aiming to depict the possible aspects that may have a role in a person's willingness to communicate in L2 (here English). (Macintyre et al., 1998) Even though the model only regards physical actions (such as actual articulated speech or raising one's hand) as embodiments of WTC (Macintyre et al., 1998), it still provides important and valid notions of aspects connecting to a learner's (un)willingness to communicate and participate in the target language of the lesson, and these notions will therefore be discussed to support the analysis in the present paper.

Since Macintyre et al.'s initial study on WTC in L2, WTC and second language learning has been further studied by researchers. Baker and Macintyre (2000), for example, investigated the relationship between WTC and gender; Munezane (2015) studied the effects of visualisation and goal setting on WTC, and Macintyre (2007) himself has also redefined his earlier notions of WTC and conceptualised it to mean a volitional process in which the participant, at that moment, chooses whether or not to communicate in the target language, and this decision is connected to multiple variables relating to the person's motivation, his/her understanding of communicational practices, and his/her confidence in the target language use (Macintyre, 2007). This updated definition will be considered in the analysis of the results.

The study from which this present study most benefits is Bernales' (2016) study of how students themselves see WTC manifesting in their participation in the foreign language classroom. Bernales studied university-level German language students and the relationship of these students' predictions of their own willingness to use the language in the classroom and the actual, occurred

willingness during the communicative tasks they were assigned to do. While the target group of Bernales' study differs greatly from that of the present study in terms of their age and the studied language (the participants in Bernales' study were university-level students studying German language whereas the target group of this study is 9th-grader English learners), the way in which Bernales views the concept of WTC is crucial here. (Bernales, 2016) Namely, she regards WTC as a holistic approach where WTC does not merely equal the embodied actions of articulated speech and raised hand signalling willingness to participate, but, rather, a dynamic system that "fluctuates due to a combination of social, environmental, and individual factors" (Bernales, 2016, p. 10). i.e. much in the same way as Macintyre views WTC in his later research (2007). These individual aspects, including processing time to produce the target/second language, familiarity of topic as well as spontaneity (Bernales, 2016), are of high importance in regard to the topic of this paper (WTC in the L2), and they will be referred to later in the analysis and discussion (sections 4 and 5). However, due to the nature and length of this paper, only what can be seen and heard will be analysed, and WTC that occurs in the pupils' minds shall be left for future studies.

2.4. Interaction Types (ITs)

The concept of WTC will be analysed through the notions of *interaction types*, presented by van Lier (1988). As the sociocultural learning that is implemented today in Finnish schools implies active interaction by the pupils, analysing occurring interaction types and what role these seem to have in the pupils' Willingness to Communicate becomes crucial. Thus, essentially related to the notions of sociocultural learning and interaction (Opetushallitus, 2010; Vygotsky, 1962), van Lier's (1988) Interaction Types (ITs) will be presented here.

van Lier (1988) presents a table depicting different characteristics that are in key role in the construction of interactional classroom activities. In this table, van Lier lists five Interaction Types (**IT**): *conversation* (IT1)*, telling* (IT2)*, elicitation* (IT3)*, ritual* (IT4a), and *group work* (IT4b) (p. 171–173). According to van Lier, these interaction types are closely related to the learner's speaking rights and duties in the classroom, which in van Lier's view means that when a certain type of interaction is performed, the learner is tied to certain set of rules and constraints. These rules and constraints, in turn, may "either encourage or discourage participation [of] the learner" (van Lier, 1988, 173–174), i.e. may be connected to the learner's WTC. He continues that what, when, how, and by whom something is said thus becomes "more or less predictable" (van Lier, 1988, 173–174), and this predictability, or rather *transparency*, of the aspects affecting the choice and

willingness to participate or not to participate are in key role in this paper. Therefore, van Lier's five interaction types (IT's) will be utilised to support the analysis in this paper.

The first of van Lier's (1988) five ITs is *conversation* (IT1). In this category, participation has the possibility to be evenly distributed and the topic can be selected and guided towards any direction by any of the speakers. In other words, the participation order is not predetermined, and anyone in the classroom, including the teacher, can participate in this interaction. Regular rules of conversation also apply (such as selecting oneself as the next speaker by indicating willingness to speak, i.e. *self-selection*, coherence in the topic, and politeness). In addition, the aim of conversation in the classroom is to engage the learners in informal talk in the target language, and even if the topic changes, the teacher should allow it, as the goal is not to enforce a certain topic. If the teacher chooses to enforce a topic, IT1 changes into IT2. (p. 171–172)

The second interaction type (*telling*, IT2) is typically predetermined, meaning that the topic cannot be decided by any one of the speakers, but it is the teacher who has decided the topic beforehand. The focus of this interaction type is on the information conveyed through it, and it can be either the teacher or one of the learners telling something. Nevertheless, the order and the topic are always predetermined by the teacher. Also, social rules of conversation apply in so that it is allowed to give "appropriate listening responses" as well as to ask for clarification or confirmation. However, sometimes the rules of conversation are limited by the teacher. For example, the teacher may instruct the pupils to save their questions till the end of the activity, and by doing so, the teacher limits the rules. (van Lier, 1988, p. 172)

The third interaction type (*elicitation*, IT3) is concerned with gathering information e.g. via questions and answers. It is typically predetermined, as the teacher has determined the topic of the questions and usually selects the participant (i.e. the speaker), with the exception of learners' requests of clarifications and confirmations, but even these must be performed at appropriate times, e.g. between questions. More specifically, the teacher may allocate the turn (i.e. give permission to participate) to a certain speaker in the classroom, in which case the participation order is predetermined. The teacher may also ask open, undirected questions, in which case the speakers self-select to participate by raising a hand and replying. (van Lier, 1988, p. 172–173) Raising one's hand will also serve as an indication of one's WTC, as has also been regarded in Macintyre et al.'s research (Macintyre et al., 1998, p. 574). Relevant here is also Ko's (2013) concept of *Q–A–C* (*question–answer–response*), in which the teacher first poses a question (either predetermined in terms of the speaker, or undirected, but predetermined in terms of topic), then receives a response from a learner, which, in turn, is followed by a possible comment from the teacher (Ko, 2013, p.

24). The interaction order in elicitations or *Q–A–C* interactions is therefore almost always predetermined and creates rules which may connect to the learners' willingness to communicate.

van Lier's (1988) fourth interaction type is *ritual* (IT4a). This IT is concerned with activities whose structure is familiar to the learners, e.g. activities such as repetition of words after teacher, pair practices, reading aloud a chapter with a partner and so forth. The interaction order of these activities is naturally predetermined, learned in time after similar repetitional activities. The regular conversational rules do not apply, as they have been replaced by the rules and constraints of the ritual activities, e.g. the teacher says a word and the class repeats it (a "I say this, you say that" type of situation, as van Lier explains (p. 173)). Interaction structure is similar to that of IT3, apart from the fact that in IT4a, multiple speakers can speaker at the same time as a chorus. (van Lier, 1988, p. 173)

The final interaction type is *group work* (IT4b). According to van Lier, this IT can form into any of the above listed ITs, depending on the type of activity that is instructed. Unlike in IT2 and IT3 but similar to IT4a, the primary speaker in IT4b is the learner, unless the group is closely observed by the teacher, in which case the teacher may become the primary speaker and the interaction order changes. (van Lier, 1988, 173)

In conclusion, the ITs presented by van Lier (1988) are either predetermined or undirected and open to self-selection (local) in terms of their interaction order and topic. Having to either conform to the rules of interaction order and the (sometimes beforehand-selected) topic or having to self-select oneself as the speaker ties the learners in the classroom in ways which may connect to the learners' WTC. I will turn to the topic of Interaction Types and Willingness to Communicate later in section 4, where I will further elaborate the possible relationship between ITs and WTC.

2.5. Learners' Identities

The relationship between language learning and (learner) identity has seen growing interest as well as remarkable changes within the foreign language learning field. As Norton and Toohey (2011) describe, linguistic knowledge (i.e. linguistic competence) was in the 1960' and 1970's primarily believed to be the key to successful language learning and appropriate use. Language was seen as a "set of idealized forms" which formed the basis on which language teaching relied. Competence was believed to precede language performance, and in order to acquire the language itself, the language learner was to aim towards acquiring those forms of language that were independent of the speakers. Similarly, the identity of the language learner was believed to be a stable and fixed

personality. (Norton & Toohey, 2011) In the 1980's, however, the belief that language and language learning is inherently social, and that the language learner and his/her identity are changing and evolving strengthened (see e.g. Norton & Toohey, 2011; Richards, 2006). The shift from the belief that competence precedes performance to the belief that language as well as language learning and use are primarily social led researchers to consider other aspects connecting to language learning and use (Norton & Toohey, 2011). Among others, the sociocultural learning approach (see section 2.2.) emerged as a specific theoretical framework. Another approach to language learning that began to settle is the relationship between language learning and identity.

One of the earliest and most influential of researchers studying identity was Mikhail Bahktin. In the 1980's, he indeed advocated the social side of language and saw language learning as a process in which learners aim to participate in "specific speech communities" (Norton & Toohey, 2011, p. 416). He thought that language learning is not a process of memorising idealised, externalised forms, but, instead, he believed that "social positions outside language might affect any individual's speaking privilege" (Norton & Toohey, 2011, p. 416). In other words, Bakhtin saw that language learning may be affected by aspects that are not external models of an idealised language, but by aspects that have to do with social aspects such as power relations or gender. Thus, Bakhtin not only touches the sociocultural learning approach but also the earliest notions of identity which have recently received remarkable attention within the field of language learning (Nasrollahi Shahri, 2018; Norton & Toohey, 2011).

The relationship between identity and language learning has within the recent 15 years received growing attention especially regarding the role of learners' changing identities in learning a second or foreign language (Nasrollahi Shahri, 2018). In these studies, the learners' *self* has become pivotal, and as the poststructuralist researchers in the field of language learning argue, the self is often defined as *diverse, dynamic, shifting* and *changing* across time and space (see e.g. Norton & Toohey, 2011; Richards, 2006). The identities, and the sense of self, of the learner thus changes in different contexts due to, for example, power relations (Norton & Toohey, 2011) and social aspects (Nasrollahi Shahri, 2018; Norton & Toohey, 2011).

The learner's self is also related to the notions of imagined communities, defined by Kanno and Norton (2010) as "[referring] to groups of people, not immediately tangible and accessible, with whom we connect through the power of imagination" (p. 241). The definition contrasts itself with those communities with which we interact daily and with which we also identify ourselves often, such as "my class" or "our neighbourhood" (p. 241). These communities exist and are concrete, whereas the imagined communities are those with which we do not interact daily. Imagined

communities are those which we imagine to exist, and to which we imagine to belong but cannot be directly interacted with or within. Drawing on Anderson (1991), Kanno and Norton suggest that nations are an example of imagined communities, because the individuals of a nation will never meet each fellow individual belonging to that nation. Thus, the concept of nation becomes imagined, and the individual citizen imagines belonging to that nation (or already belongs in the form of nationality and so forth). The sense of belonging to that nation is nevertheless strong, and the same effect, according to Kanno and Norton, can apply to language learners. (Kanno & Norton, 2010) The sense of community does not, therefore, require concrete groups with which we engage daily, but, rather, the imagination of belonging to the certain group. The way the learner's sense of self relates to the notions of imagined communities is that in a situation where there can be no direct interaction between a real (or authentic) community, through the *self* the individual imagines him-/herself interacting with or within as well as belonging to that community. The self and imagination are thus tools with which the individual is able to connect with communities that are not directly and concretely reachable in that particular context.

The imagined belonging to a certain group relates crucially also to the notion of learning and motivation. The concept of imagined communities led Kanno and Norton (2010) to argue for the important relationship between language learning and motivation. As they describe in the case of two language learners (of English and Japanese respectively), the imagined nature of the cultures they envisioned when learning the language "profoundly affected the learners' investment in the target language" in so that the first learner had strong motivation to maintain his first language instead of the language he was trying to learn, and the second learner withdrew from a language course because the teacher's discouragement collided with the learner's imagined picture of the target language and community (Kanno & Norton, 2010, p. 243). This shows that imagined community (and imagined identity) strongly connects to the learners' motivation, and thus has direct influence on language learning.

A concept that becomes important in analysing how learners' identities connect with their willingness to communicate in the classroom is *investment.* This concept derives from the notions of motivation and has its origins in Norton's study which investigated immigrant women in Canada (Norton, 2000). She found that even though a learner had high levels of motivation towards the language being learned, it did not always "result in 'good' language learning" (Norton & Toohey, 2011, p. 420). In a later study, Norton and Toohey (2011) explain that a language learner's views on good language teaching may be contradictory to those of the teacher, which may then lead to "compromising the learner's investment in the language practices of the classroom" and the

language learner not being "invested in the language practices of a given classroom", despite the high levels of motivation (p. 421). This led Norton to develop a concept to complement the earlier notions of motivation, and together with Toohey defines investment as "signal[ling] the socially and historically constructed relationship of the learners to the target language and their sometimes ambivalent desire to learn and practice it" (p. 420). In other words, the concept of investment complements the concept of motivation and provides another perspective to the study of language learning. Further, it also connects the notions of investment and imagined communities, as the imagined communities provide learners with tools to increase their levels of motivation and investment on the language. Therefore, this perspective also connects the concepts of investment and authenticity, bringing the question of identity and investment into the sociocultural learning framework.

This is the framework on which the present study relies. This study beliefs that the learner's sense of self and his/her identities are dynamic, diverse and changing due to various situational aspects, and that these identities may have a role in how the learner learns the language as well as which language the learner chooses to use in different situations. Understanding the complex phenomenon of language learning and how the different situational aspects, such as the interaction types, situated identities and imagined communities, may influence language learning are indeed the purposes of this paper.

2.6. Situated Identity, Discourse Identity, and Transportable Identity

Relating to the different identities that a learner may have in the classroom, Zimmerman (1998), presents a table with three aspects of identity: *situated identity, discourse identity,* and *transportable identity***.** These three aspects of identity are closely related to the present study's exploration of the relationship between the language learner and their identities. The aspects will thus form the theoretical background on which this study relies in the analysis of the possible reasons behind learners' (un-)WTC. The three identity categories will be discussed in detail below.

As Zimmerman (1998) defines, *discourse identities* deal with the sequentially organized activities and the identities which the participants in that particular interactional instance adopt. According to Zimmerman, participants "assume discourse identities" while engaging in the "moment-by-moment" roles of that interaction. These roles are e.g. speaker, listener, questioner or answerer. These roles are assumed by one party selecting the role (e.g. the story-teller) and the other(s) accommodating to the "projected identity" (e.g. the listener). Rather than being binding, the

discourse identities fluctuate and change according to the context. (Zimmerman, 1998, p. 91) In regard to the present study, this category may provide a useful perspective into the identities of the learners and how these identities possibly connect to the learners' WTC in the L2.

While discourse identities deal with the very specific conversational roles that discourse participants assume in a situation, *situated identities*, on the other hand, relate to the broader roles of that instance. As Zimmerman (1998) explains, the roles in this broader view include roles such as a doctor and a patient, an interviewer and the interviewee, or, as is relevant in this study, a teacher and a student. The participants assume the identities that display an accurate orientation to that particular situation, and, much like in the previous category, the situated identities are not binding, and they change according to the situation. In addition, the discourse identities enable the existence of situated identities. (Zimmerman, 1998) This identity category is relevant to the present paper particularly in terms of the teacher–pupil identity sets. This category may also provide useful insights into how learner's WTC may fluctuate if the roles, for some reason, change and the teacher becomes the one who learns and the pupil the one who teaches, or if one of the learners become the teacher and another one the pupil, for instance. Examining the possibly fluctuating roles in different educational instances in the classroom may provide useful perspectives into the analysis; therefore, this category will also be discussed and analysed later in section 4.

Finally, the third identity category presented by Zimmerman (1998) is *transportable identity*. This identity category is concerned with individuals as well as their identities that follow the individuals in their daily activities: these identities are often visible and can be recognised by physical features (such as an athletic body, a specific piece of clothing or the way in which the individual acts). These identities are not tied to the specific interaction, such as the ones above; instead, they are identities that the individual carries along, that are external to that particular situation but to which the individual may refer in that specific situation. (Zimmerman, 1998) As an example, a teacher may be teaching the pupils in a classroom about manners, and while teaching, she may refer to her son and say: "As a mother, I always say this to my son, but he never obeys." In that instance, speaker is thus the teacher's discourse identity, teacher her situated identity, and by referring to her motherhood she also identifies with her transportable identity, motherhood. Again, this identity category may provide useful information on the role which identities may have in the learners' WTC in so that a learner may, for instance, have difficulties in relating to the transportable identities present in a classroom and feel discomfort in bringing forth his/her own identity by participating.

Drawing on current beliefs on language learning and identity, the present study suggests that all the aspects discussed above (i.e. LPP, identities, motivation, authentic and meaningful communication

and investment) are connected, and takes this belief as the background on which the analysis relies: The sociocultural learning approach applied in Finnish schools highlights *authentic* and *meaningful* communication both between the learners themselves and between the learner and the outside world. If we consider the communication between the learners and the outside world, it could be argued that the possibility to interact authentically with a native speaker could enhance language learning by motivating the learners to communicate with the native speaker – as this type of communication is, in a rather self-explanatory way, authentic. Thus, if no "authentic" (here meaning native) speaker of a language is available, the imagined connection to those authentic (native) communities makes the interactions in the classroom, i.e. between the learners, meaningful (Kanno & Norton, 2010). The pupil may then potentially find him-/herself more motivated to *invest* on the language learning in comparison to a situation in which the learner has not imagined belonging to or interacting within this specific imagined community.

2.7. The Importance of This Study in Relation to WTC and Identity

As important a concept as it may be, Willingness to Communicate has not yet, nevertheless, been studied extensively, as it is a relatively new concept within SLA (Bernales, 2016; Pawlak & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, 2015). It has been studied e.g. by Macintyre et al. (1998), Pawlak and Mystkowska-Wiertelak (2015) and Bernales (2016), and the studies have concerned themselves with WTC among high school or university-level language learners. The theory about WTC in comprehensive school language classes, however, is still very limited and requires more research. Indeed, that is what the present paper aims to contribute to – the gap in the theory of WTC among language learners in comprehensive schools in Finland. Moreover, the results of WTC have thus far been discovered in more or less artificial and laboratory settings (see e.g. Pawlak & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, 2015), and the goal of this study is to discover the implications of the sociocultural theory in practice and to explore whether or not WTC can be seen on the field, i.e. in the real-life settings of actual language classes. Further yet, language learners' identities and language learning have received attention in the recent years, but learner identities have not yet been studied in relation to WTC. That is why the relationship of these two concepts is studied in this paper.

In addition to the general knowledge of WTC in the sociocultural language learning field that this paper aims to contribute to, the tentative results of this paper may also be beneficial for researchers in Finland who concern themselves with practical implications of the national curriculum for language teaching in Finland. Namely, the Finnish National Core Curriculum for Basic Education (Opetushallitus, 2014) has been implemented in schools since 2016, as briefly mentioned above. As

discussed, its practical implications on language classes are, thus, relatively new and may need further investigation.

It is also worthy to keep in mind that English as a foreign language (compared to other languages studied as a second or foreign language) is in a category of its own, due to its ever-growing, pervasive role in many of today's societies, including Finland (Leppänen, 2011). This, in my opinion, can affect the way English is seen by the pupils learning the language, but it does not affect the results per se. The way the role of English should be noted here is that the exposure to English in the everyday media may facilitate the learning of e.g. certain vocabulary, intonation patterns, and grammatical structures (House, 2003). The exposure to English and the possible real-life interaction with native speakers may also further motivate the pupils to learn the language (Leppänen, 2011). However, I do not see these aspects directly affecting the results of this study, as the increased linguistic competence (whether in vocabulary, grammar or even in interaction) does not always equal to WTC (Macintyre et al., 1998), but, instead, there are multiple situational aspects that account for the pupils' willingness to communicate in the target language (such as familiarity of topic and time to prepare for communication; Bernales, 2016). Therefore, the role of English as a global language will not be considered as a category of its own when discussing the reasons behind pupils' WTC.

For the sake of clarity, the concepts *communication* and *participation* are considered synonyms, as the subtle difference in their respectful meanings does not play a crucial role in this study. *Participation* can, according to some researchers, also include participation that occurs inside the learner's mind (Bernales, 2016), but as part of the concept of *communication* many researchers also see communication that is non-verbal and may, similarly to the concept of participation, also partly occur in the learner's mind (Macintyre, 2007). In addition, this study does not aim to discover the learners' communication/participation that occurs inside the learners' minds (Bernales, 2016; Macintyre, 2007), but, rather, seeks to discover what role Interaction Types can be *seen* to have in the learners' WTC, and, therefore, the difference between the two concepts is not relevant in this paper. To signify any participation or communication on the learners' part will henceforth be referred to as communication. The research participants will also be referred to as *pupils*.

3. Data and Methods

In this section, the data and methods will be presented. First, I will describe the data, following with the method of data collection. Lastly, I will present the method of data analysis.

3.1. The Data

The data of this study consists of observations on two thematically consecutive 75-minute EFL lessons for two groups of 9th-graders in the upper-level comprehensive school in a city in Finland. The participants in this study consist of 23 pupils (the first group) and 20 pupils (the second group). The data was gathered in November 2018 using naturalistic, *observer-as-participant* observation (Angrosino, 2007; Wragg, 1999). The data was collected by observing the pupils and writing the observations on a Word document.

The reason to study 9th-graders is that I wanted to study pupils that are on the same level in their English studies. Naturally, the level of English language skills varies within a grade and within a class. However, only studying 9th-graders made it possible to limit the variety of skill levels to the same grade, as, according to the Finnish National Curriculum for Basic Education (Opetushallitus, 2014), the pupils on the ninth grade have certain goals and skill levels that a 9th-grader should have reached by the end of year nine. In addition, year nine it is the last year of the Finnish comprehensive school, which means is the year after which the pupils are expected to have gathered sufficient knowledge on various subjects (including English) to be able to continue either to vocational school or to upper secondary school (Opetushallitus, 2014). Thus, the pupils are also expected to have gathered the basics of English at the end of the year nine, which supports the decision to study 9th-graders.

Another reason to study pupils on the ninth grade is also the fact the pupils have hopefully learned specific learning and working methods by the time they enter the ninth grade. This means that the pupils on the 9th grade are, at least theoretically, able to concentrate on the subject itself rather than on the working methods. In addition, only two classes rather three or four different classes were studied because this paper wishes to gain a more wholistic picture of communicating in a language. For the purposes of this paper, then, it is sufficient to study only a limited set of pupils (here two different classes) thoroughly, and study it from different perspectives in order to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomenon.

3.2. The Method of Data Collection

The methodology for collecting the data for this study is *naturalistic observation*. According to Wragg (1999), naturalistic observation is examining and observing the behaviour of the studied subject in its natural settings without interference from the researcher. Two aspects are relevant in the naturalistic observation: the situation is neither manipulated nor controlled in any means by the researcher (1), and the situation is not initiated nor created by the observer (2). (Wragg, 1999) Both of these aspects hold true in the present study, as the lessons were not initiated by the researcher, nor did the researcher manipulate the participants or the interaction in the classroom. In order to keep in minimum the teacher and pupils' reactivity according to the topic of the study (i.e. learner's willingness to communicate in the target language), nor the teacher or the pupils were told the topic of the study.

Using naturalistic, non-participant observation as the method, i.e. observing as *observer-as-participant* (Angrosino, 2007), provided this study with data that could be analysed within the theoretical framework of Willingness to Communicate presented in section 2. Applying the model for naturalistic observation ensured that WTC could be examined as it naturally happens in a classroom environment. This means the present study was able to retain some ecological validity (Wragg, 1999), which also increases the value of this paper, as WTC has not yet been extensively researched in authentic environments. Regarding the non-participant observation, it was also necessary to try to see life as it is, ruling out any experiments (Wragg, 1999, p. 58). I could not, therefore, ask the teacher to pay attention to encouraging the pupils to communicate in the target language of the lesson, for example. This is also related to reactivity, defined by Angrosino as situations where the studied phenomenon changes due to the participants' knowledge of the ongoing research (2007). Reactivity will be further discussed below.

Relevant in terms of the trustworthiness of the results is also the fact that the data was gathered in a school which is not used to persons observing their classes. This school is not under university (i.e. it is not a teacher training school in which the pupils and the teachers alike are used to teacher students observing the classes) but a regular upper-level comprehensive school with 7^{th}- to 9^{th} -graders, typically without interference of a person observing the lesson. On the one hand, examining pupils in a regular local school provides ecological validity for this research (Wragg, 1999), as 1) the school is a typical local Finnish school with the very basic ("traditional") classroom layout and technology, and 2) the interactions in the classroom are real-life interactions that would happen even if I, the researcher, was not there. On the other hand, using naturalistic, non-participant observation as the method of collecting data, i.e. observing the class as an outsider, poses a

contradiction between the typical lessons and the lessons I observed, as the pupils clearly acknowledged my presence when they entered the classroom (each pupil glanced at where I was sitting), hence, the reactivity of the pupils (Angrosino, 2007) was not entirely inexistent.

Indeed, one of the issues regarding the trustworthiness of the research results was reactivity, i.e. situations where the performance of the studied phenomenon is changed due to the participants' knowledge of the ongoing research (Angrosino, 2007). To keep reactivity to the minimum, the topic of the study was not told to the teacher nor the pupils. However, as the school in which the data was gathered is not used to external observations, having an outsider in the classroom naturally increases the reactivity since the situation contained unusual aspects for the teacher and the pupils. Due to ethical reasons, I was also obliged to ask the teacher for a permission for this study. She then informed the pupils of the research and asked them the permission to observe them, thus allowing the participants to know that they are under study.

Another aspect relating to the research participants' reactivity is the fact that during both lessons, the teacher brought my presence into the pupils' attention by introducing me and mentioning that I will be observing the lesson as part of my studies at the university. On the first lesson, the teacher also encouraged the pupils to raise their hands as, according to the teacher, they were "clearly shy" that day. In addition, on the second lesson that I observed, the teacher asked me to translate a few sentences that remained untranslated of a books' chapter that each student had taken turns in translating. These aspects need to be taken into account, as the pupils' attention was drawn into my presence in the classroom. To some extent this is in contradiction with the ethics of naturalistic observation, according to which the reactivity of the participants under study should be kept at minimum (Wragg, 1999). However, my acknowledged presence does not necessarily affect the topic of this research (i.e. learners' WTC) and the results, as the teacher was neither manipulated nor encouraged by I, the researcher, to draw me to the pupils' attention, nor was the situation initiated by the observer, but it occurred naturally and of the teacher's own will (Wragg, 1999). Furthermore, as Angrosino notes, in cases (such as this) where the researcher is of the type *observer-as-participant*, the observer is acknowledged and recognised but solely as a researcher rather than as a participant (Angrosino, 2007). Further still, observational studies are one form of qualitative studies, and as qualitative studies, they provide valid information on the issue at hand. Qualitative studies under humanities should not and cannot always remain as objective as for example quantitative studies under natural sciences should.

One final aspect to note about non-participant observation is the risk of not being as objective as one should be. I, for example, have experience on classroom interaction from the teacher practice as well as from the temporary posts when substituting for an English language teacher. However, considering the nature of qualitative studies, the purpose is to understand rather than to generalise, and in seeking to understand the issue under study and observation (here learner's WTC in the L2), the researcher's own background forms the basis for analysis and interpretation, particularly in terms of the role of learners' changing identities in language learning. In addition, the concept of Willingness to Communicate was new to me, and regardless of my earlier experience of classroom interaction, I had at the beginning of this study no closer insight as to the topic of WTC, i.e. why the pupils are (un)willing to participate in the second language (L2). In other words, I had observed that there is both reluctance and willingness to communicate in the target language, wished to understand the phenomenon more deeply and used this background knowledge as the starting point in the study. As to the collection of the data itself, I was to remain objective to the extent that I could and was to set aside all subjective notions of possible reasons behind WTC and merely objectively observe what happened in the classroom.

It should also be noted that the number of participants in this study was purposefully small. Due to the scale and scope of this study, only two classes were observed, and the results, accordingly, are tentative and cannot be generalised to a wider group as such. The aim of this case study, however, is to investigate and understand some of the key concepts concerning WTC in the Finnish context and to explore how these concepts can be seen in practice in actual, real-life settings rather than under laboratory, artificial conditions (Pawlak & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, 2015). Depending on the results, this study may possibly present insights into valuable issues for further, more large-scale research regarding the relationship between Willingness to Communicate, learners' identity and second (or foreign) language acquisition within the sociocultural framework.

3.3. The Method of Data Analysis

The field notes gathered during the observations were transcribed and analysed qualitatively with methods which are common to observational data collection methods. The data was analysed closely, searching for common aspects that may form categories and labels (Angrosino, 2007). More precisely, the analysis process consisted of *descriptive analysis*, in which the data was sorted into smaller segments and components, and of *theoretical analysis*, in which the emerged components were analysed closely in order to discover whether they form patterns, regularities or

categories in the context of the theoretical framework (Angrosino, 2007), here EFL learners' WTC in the target language of the lesson. An example of the analysis process is provided below.

The field notes gathered during the two English lessons were translated and transcribed onto a Microsoft Word document. The data was examined carefully (*descriptive analysis*) in order to discover reoccurring aspects by colour-coding elements that had similarities. These aspects were then categorised accordingly, applying van Lier's (1988) Interaction Types (ITs) in order to discover general situations or settings in which pupils actually communicated in the lesson's target language (English) and when in their mutual mother tongue (Finnish), i.e. *theoretical analysis* was conducted. Finally, from these ITs a tentative idea of how ITs seemed to connect to the pupils' Willingness to Communicate (WTC) was drawn. In Appendices, Appendix 1 shows how the descriptive analysis was conducted, and Appendix 2 depicts the theoretical analysis (see section Appendices). A few examples of each category are provided.

4. Analysis

In this section, the results of the analysis will be presented. I have described the process of analysis in section 3, whereas here I will describe more thoroughly the results that emerged from the analysis regarding the role which Interaction Types potentially have in learners' Willingness to Communicate and how the learner's own identity may connect to the decision to communicate in the L2. The analysis showed that Interaction Types indeed seem to connect both to the Finnish EFL learners' willingness to communicate and to the language in which they decide to communicate. In addition, the analysis showed that changing identities (situated identity in particular; Zimmerman, 1998) as well as the concept of imagined communities (Kanno & Norton, 2010) may be connected to the learners' decision (or willingness) to communicate in the L2. According to the analysis, the language of communication may depend on many variational and situational aspects, such as the familiarity of the instructed task. The results will be discussed below.

4.1. Conversation (IT1) and the Learners' WTC

The analysis of the data showed that the pupils do not engage in conversation in the second language (L2) unless they have access to supporting vocabulary or prompting questions in English. During the first lesson, the teacher instructed the pupils to discuss what they had heard from a tape which played a conversation between a doctor and a patient. The teacher instructed the pupils to discuss in English, but none of the pupils did this. Instead, they spoke in Finnish:

(1) *"Nii mitä tässä piti tehä"* ('So what were we supposed to do here') and *"No sillä oli pää kipiä ja silmät punaset"* ('Well her head hurt and her eyes were red').

The example presents two lines said by two pupils. The first line shows that the pupil was unsure of the given task and clarified in Finnish (L1) the instructions from a classmate. The second line shows an example of the type of conversations that were present in the classroom after the teacher instructed the pupils to discuss: instead of discussing in detail and in English (L2) what they had heard, the pupil quickly listed the symptoms in L1. Noteworthy here is indeed the language in which they performed these lines. Instead of discussing the issue in L2, the pupils used their mutual L1 to either clarify the instructions or to quickly list the symptoms, almost in a "let's be done with it" way, which is indicated by the word "well" at the beginning of the second line. This was said quickly, and without a pause the pupil continued with the rest of the sentence with a falling tone,

which makes it seem like the pupil wanted to be done with the exercise quickly – as if he was saying: “Well her head hurt and her eyes were red, period. Now let’s move on.”

In terms of the pupils’ identities in the examples above, the pupils addressed their words to their classmates, and it seems that they spoke as themselves, a classmate to classmate, instead of speaking as a pupil, for example. Of the three identity categories presented in section 2 (Zimmerman, 1998), the category that proves significant in examining the examples above is that of situated identities. In the instance above, the pupils perhaps identified themselves as classmates, which means that their situated identities in the instances above are a classmate asking clarifications from a peer (example 1), or a classmate talking to another peer (example 2). Neither of the pupils above spoke in the L2, which indicates that they did not see themselves as, for example, language learners or language users in the situation, but rather as two classmates making sense of the task. The reason for this may be that in both instance 1 and instance 2, the pupils knew that the person sitting next to them shared their first language (Finnish) and saw no need to speak in L2.

In the instances above, the pupils did not have any supporting material in front of them but had to rely on their own recollections of what they had heard and understood. Only if the pupils had access to vocabulary or other supporting material did they engage in a conversation in English. As another example, on the second observed lesson (which thematically was a consecutive lesson to the first lesson, only for different groups), the pupils were instructed to discuss their own imaginary symptoms and illnesses in English, and they were allowed to have their books open at the page which provided some hospital and illness vocabulary as well as questions in English. In this exercise, the pupils took turns in being the doctor and the patient, and they discussed the patient’s symptoms and illnesses. The pupils used English throughout the activity, which made it seem that if given access to supporting vocabulary and questions in the L2, the pupils were willing to communicate in the L2.

In the example above, the pupils may have identified themselves as language learners, i.e. their situated identities are language learners (Zimmerman, 1998). It seems that in doing so, the pupils know what the expectations of the exercises are, what they have to do in order to pass the lesson or even the course, and they perhaps also know that this will help them learn and survive in similar situations in the outside world. Here, the pupils may thus have been able to, at least subconsciously, envision a context in which these skills may prove useful, and have found motivation to do this exercise in the target language instead of discussing the issues in their mutual L1. Therefore, the concept of imagined communities (Kanno & Norton, 2010) may have made the pupils invest (Norton & Toohey, 2011) on the task at hand and on language learning, as well.

Spontaneous conversations that occurred in the classroom were in the learners L1 (Finnish). Throughout the first and the second lesson that were observed, multiple instances showed that the language of communication outside the topic of the lesson occurred in the pupils' L1. When the pupils were, for example, instructed to work in pairs, there was always at least one pupil who said:

(1) *"Nii mitä tässä piti tehä?"* ('So what were we supposed to do here?'),
(2) *"No alota sää"* ('Well you go first'),
(3) *"Ai hä?"* ('Eh what?')
(4) *"No jatkanko mää?* ('Well shall I continue?') or
(5) *"Eiksun piä esittää sitä"* ('Weren't you supposed to play [the doctor]').

All of the examples above show that the pupils use their mutual L1 to make sense of the task. The pupils interacted with each other in their mutual L1 when beginning the task, either to confirm the instructions of the given task (examples 4 and 5), to signify uncertainty (examples 2 and 4), to urge the partner to begin (2) or to ensure that the partner had understood the instructions correctly (example 6). Interactions of this type always occurred in the pupils' first language, which can be an indication of the fact that when solving problems and making sense of a task, the pupils are accustomed to communicating in their mutual L1 outside the classroom and on all other lessons apart from language lessons. Thus, the learners seem to show WTC in the L2 if given access to vocabulary, whereas WTC in the L2 appears to decrease if the pupils have to memorise in the L2, without any supporting tools, what they have heard.

In addition, it is likely that the pupils in these situations identify themselves as *themselves*, i.e. the situated pupil identities briefly move aside and their selves as the 15- or 16-year-old Finnish teenagers come forth (Norton & Toohey, 2011). In the instances where the pupils seek to make sense of the task at hand and solve a context-related problem, they seem to work as peers rather than as pupils or language learners and prefer their mutual L1 instead of the L2 of the lesson. It could thus be that because Finnish is the pupils' L1 and therefore primarily their cognitive language, i.e. the language in which much of the thinking occurs, the pupils, perhaps subconsciously, use their L1 to make sense of a task and to clarify, to confirm, to urge or to signify uncertainty.

4.2. Telling (IT2) and Learners' WTC

As to van Lier's (1988) second interaction type, telling, the pupils showed neither willingness to communicate in the L2 or willingness to communicate in L1. The data showed that the focus of this interaction type in the classroom indeed was on the information conveyed through it (e.g. comparing adverbs), and the topic of the interaction type (telling) was always predetermined by the teacher (Van Lier, 1988). In every IT2 that occurred in the data, the teacher was the one telling the pupils what to do: she told the pupils about the structure of the coming lesson, she instructed them to do a certain type of exercise, and she told them about the theory of the grammar topic that they were studying that day (adverbs). The students neither interrupted the teacher as she was speaking, nor did they ask for clarifications or confirmations directly from the teacher after she had finished her instructions/teaching of grammar. Rather, the students asked in L1 for clarifications from the peers, as can be seen in the following example:

(1) *"Nii mitä tässä piti tehä?"* ('So what were we supposed to do here?')

In other words, the social rules of conversation applied in IT2 that occurred in the classroom (van Lier, 1988): the students did not interrupt the teacher, but neither did they ask for clarifications after the instructions, which implies that in this data, IT2 may have influenced the learners' WTC both in L2 and in L1 in so that they did not communicate in neither language but chose to listen to the teacher. However, WTC in the L1 occurred when the pupils turned to their peers to ask for clarifications, i.e. made sense of the task.

IT2's relation to the learners' identities is worth examining here. As, among others, Richards (2006) explains, it is the teacher who often controls the course of the classroom and is in charge of the conversations and tasks occurring in the class, while the learners "respond directly to these turns" (Richards, 2006, p. 61). The teacher thus has the power over the learners, and the dominating, teacher-led dynamics in the classroom is often accepted by both the teacher and the pupils (van Lier, 2007). Therefore, the prevailing dynamics and power relations of the classroom may be the reason why the pupils choose not to interrupt the teacher as she is instructing – perhaps the pupils feel uneasy questioning the role of the teacher by interrupting or asking for clarifications, or perhaps they feel uncomfortable in showing that they have not listened carefully to the instructions, for example. Whatever the reason, the power relations in the classroom may also partly be accounted for why the pupils prefer turning to their peers to ask for clarifications: regarding the power relations, the pupils are, at this given instance, equals listening to the teacher and proceeding to the new task. When they turn to their peers for clarifications, they do not have to address the teacher

with clarifying questions or interruptions and that way question the simplicity of the teacher's instructions, for example, but, instead, they can turn to the peers. In that particular situation and context, the pupils may be identifying themselves as a peer to peer, and it may be easier or perhaps more natural for them to ask for clarifications from a classmate who, as discussed, is equal in terms of the power relations in the instance (Richards, 2006; Zimmerman, 1998). Furthermore, the reason behind the pupils' language of communication between each other (L1) may lie in the fact that they identify to the particular task and situation as themselves (Norton & Toohey, 2011). Because they are accustomed to communicating with each other in their mutual L1, communicating in the L1 in this situation may seem natural (see section 4.1.).

4.3. Elicitation (IT3) and Learners' WTC

According to van Lier (1988), elicitation is concerned with gathering information via questions and answers. As discussed in section 2, the teacher has determined the topic of the questions and usually selects the participant (i.e. the pupil), with the exception of learners' requests of clarifications and confirmations that must be performed at appropriate times, e.g. between questions. (van Lier, 1988) Clarifying questions addressed to the teacher did not occur in this data, but elicitation as an interaction type (IT3) did occur continuously. The teacher asked a question, to which one of the pupils was selected to answer, e.g. in the following instance:

(6) Teacher: *"Millä päätteillä englannin kielessä ilmaistaan adverbit?"* ('What are the suffixes that mark adverbs in English?')
Pupil Y: *"-L Y"* (pronounced as Finnish letters)
Teacher: *"Good."*

In this example, the teacher asked the pupils a question about grammar, and from those who had raised their hands (i.e. showed WTC), she selected pupil Y to reply. The pupil pronounced the letters in a Finnish way, which can be interpreted as communicating in Finnish (L1), but as grammar is often taught in the pupils' L1, i.e. the teacher was asking the question in L1, it seems natural that the pupil also replied in L1, especially as the pupil was not instructed to do otherwise. Here, the pupils who showed WTC and replied to the teacher's questions may have known the expectations of that situation, and thus may have identified him-/herself as the pupil who knows that by replying to the teacher's questions s/he is regarded as "a good student" or at least a pupil who actively shows s/he wishes to show their language abilities and to participate. If the pupils' social identity indeed is *the pupil* in these types of situations, the pupils perhaps know what 'being a

(good) pupil' entails (e.g. that a pupil is often expected to answer the teacher's questions) and has acted accordingly, i.e. has replied to the teacher's question and that way showed WTC.

In interaction types that are similar to those of *Q–A–C* (*question–answer–comment;* Ko, 2013), the pupils could self-select themselves to participate by raising their hand and thus signify their WTC (Macintyre et al., 1998). The teacher in this data selected the final speaker, which means not all those who raised their hand (i.e. signalled their willingness to communicate) were able to actually communicate, but as this paper studies what can be seen in the classroom, it is sufficient to regard raising one's hand as a mark of WTC (Macintyre et al., 1998, p. 547). In this light, being able to self-select oneself to communicate seemed to increase learners' willingness to communicate.

The teacher also allocated the turn to participate to a certain speaker in the classroom (van Lier, 1988). In these interaction types (i.e. allocation of turns without the pupil raising their hand), the communication order is predetermined and has an effect particularly on the order in which the pupils communicate. Also, self-selection is not allowed. (van Lier, 1988) For example, at one point during the first lesson, the teacher asked a simple adverb in Finnish and said the name of one of the pupils. This pupil was then expected to reply by saying the corresponding adverb in English (*hard*), which the pupil also did. The teacher used this technique (allocation of turns to a specific speaker) on multiple occasions during the two lessons, and she always did it by asking a question that required only one or two words in English or Finnish as a response. In the data, the selected pupil always replied, either in the L2 or L1, depending on which language was expected to be used (e.g. if the pupil was expected to translate a word into Finnish, the pupil naturally used L1; in other cases, L2 was used).

The teacher also asked simple questions such as:

(7) *"Exercise four, have you done it?"*

and as far as I could observe, all of the pupils replied in chorus:

"Yes!"

In these examples, the pupils replied to questions that required only a short reply. This seems to show that the pupils were willing to communicate in the L2 (or in L1 in cases of translations) if the expected response was short (one or two words). It also appears, on the one hand, that the pupils are willing to communicate in the L2 if the class can reply in chorus and are not separately put in the spotlight and made to fear making a mistake. On the other hand, the pupils also seem willing to communicate in L2 if the teacher allocates the turn specifically to them. Among others, Hashemi

(2011) has discovered that language anxiety and the fear of losing one's face or identity among language learners occur when learners face difficult or challenging situations (Hashemi, 2011). In the fear of "losing face", then, the learners in this present study may also feel that they have to reply when given the turn – otherwise they would perhaps find themselves in an uncomfortable or embarrassing situation in front of the classmates.

Fear of embarrassment may also be connected to the pupils' identities in the given situations. If the teacher calls upon a particular pupil, the pupil is made to make a quick choice either to reply or not to reply. The pupil does not have time to assess whether or not she considers herself ready to communicate. In addition, allocation of turns eliminates the possibility to self-select oneself. When a teacher allocates the turn, then, the situation is unexpected for the pupil (i.e. similar to that of spontaneous problems in which the pupils seem to communicate as themselves, see section 4.4.). The pupil may feel that a reply is expected shortly, which may then make the pupil reply quickly and *as herself* (especially if the pupil's reaction and response is relatively quick and almost automatic, as was the case with the examples of IT3 in this paper). The pupil may also feel that teacher is testing the pupil's language skills, and due to that, the pupil would be speaking as *herself* rather than as a *pupil* or *a language learner*, especially if the pupil has to reply in front of the peers, who most likely consider the person as *herself* at that moment. This may possibly make the pupil willing to invest on communicating in the L2 as himself (Norton & Toohey, 2011), and to choose to reply rather than not to reply and that way, as herself, lose face in front of the peers.

The choice to reply when called upon is perhaps further reinforced by the fact that all of the pupils in the classroom are very likely to be accustomed to the rules of this interaction type, as it occurred multiple times in the data. The pupil to whom the turn is allocated may find it reassuring that most of the pupils in the classroom know the rules, i.e. they know that the pupil who is called upon might have not expected her turn, is caught by surprise, perhaps; has little time to articulate and is expected an answer shortly. Because of this, the pupil may find that answering incorrectly is more acceptable in a situation where the pupil was not allowed to self-select and prepare in comparison to instances where the pupil self-selected, i.e. considered his answer correct or adequate, and then discovers that the reply was, somehow, incorrect or inadequate. The pupils may feel that the latter is far more embarrassing than replying incorrectly when not having time to assess their reply and self-select. Choosing to reply and possibly answering incorrectly may, in other words, be considered the better option in comparison to choosing not to reply at all and losing face in front of the classmates.

4.4. Ritual (IT4a) and Learners' WTC

In the case of van Lier's fourth interaction category, (IT4a – ritual; van Lier, 1988), the data provided numerous examples. One example of ritual activities is that of translation: The teacher instructed the pupils to go in the hallway for 15 minutes and translate a new text in the book in small groups. After those 15 minutes, the pupils returned, and the teacher said:

(8) *"Tehdään jälleen niin, että suomennetaan kappale vuorotellen."* ('Let's take turns again and translate the chapter one by one.')

In the above example, the teacher first asked the pupils to go in the hallway for a while and translate a text in small groups. After the pupils returned to the classroom, the teacher instructed the pupils to take turns in translating two or three assigned sentences of the text they had been studying. The word 'jälleen' (meaning *again* in English) in the instructions signalled that the class had done that type of activity before, and the pupils thus knew what to expect. After that, the pupils indeed took turns in translating into Finnish two or three sentences of the text that originally was in English, and each pupil translated on their turn, i.e. they were willing to communicate. Even though the communication itself was in Finnish, it is still relevant here, because translating a text requires active examination and analysis of the original text (that was in English). This means the pupils had to understand the English sentences before being able to translate it into their L1, i.e. they had to cognitively use the L2 (Cook, 2001). Because all the pupils in that class indeed translated the sentences that were assigned to them, it can be interpreted that a familiar type of activity, i.e. to know what is to be expected, may increase the learners' WTC. In this case, it was WTC in L1, but as it was predetermined what each of the pupils was to say, and they had to actively examine the original sentences in the L2, I regard this case as relevant in terms of WTC in the L2. Noteworthy in this instance is also the fact that the pupils had time to prepare for the upcoming task. Each pupil had 15 minutes to translate the text into Finnish, after which they performed the task, and each pupil participated. In this particular data, it thus seems that also time to prepare may increase learners' WTC in the L2.

A familiar type of activity as well as time to prepare oneself for a task, both of which significantly relate to knowing what to expect, may also be connected to the learners' identities. In the instance above (1), the pupils listen to the teacher's instructions and act accordingly, after which they perform the given task. In this example, the learners' situated identities seem to be *the pupil*, i.e. the learners situationally identify themselves as pupils listening to instructions given by the teacher (Zimmerman, 1998), and possibly knew that by preparing adequately to the upcoming task they

would be able to participate and be considered as good students. In other words, knowing what they as pupils were expected to do after those 15 minutes in the hallway (i.e. translating in front of everyone else in the classroom) may have given the pupils either motivation to prepare, or in Norton and Toohey's words, motivation to *invest* on preparing for the task in advance instead of ignoring the instructions to prepare themselves in the hallway and possibly failing to be able to translate the assigned sentences (2011). In turn, having invested on the upcoming task may have provided the pupils with confidence to perform the translating task in front of the peers. Had one pupil not prepared in advance, s/he might have felt uncomfortable with translating the sentences, and, in the fear or losing face in front of the peers, s/he might have chosen not to participate, i.e. s/he might have shown unwillingness to communicate (Hashemi, 2011). However, in this data, the pupils, who seemed to identify to the instructions and the task as pupils, indeed invested in and prepared for the task, and showed WTC in the example above.

Another example of how familiar task format influences WTC occurred when the class discussed comparing adverbs. The teacher said "slowly" and then spread her hands as if to encourage the pupils to say something. The pupils then replied in chorus: "More slowly, most slowly". It implied that the pupils knew what the teacher expected of them, and they seemed to communicate willingly without any further verbal instructions from the teacher. Important to note of this activity is also the fact that the teacher asked a question to which the pupils could reply in short, straightforward responses ("more slowly, most slowly") which do not necessarily require creative thinking on the pupils' part. Drawing from this example, it appears that two things strongly connect to the learners' WTC in the L2: a familiar type of activity to which the pupils are accustomed and in which they know what they are expected to do, as well as being able to reply in short, straightforward, often one- or two-word replies which do not require much creative or spontaneous thinking. In the first case, it appears that the pupils were able to identify themselves as *pupils* in performing the tasks, and, as discussed, knowing what to expect seems to facilitate the pupils' expression of their pupil self and increases WTC in the L2. In the latter case, the pupils could identify themselves as *pupils* or *learners of English*. In the background of the latter case lies the assumption that students, especially those aiming for higher grades, are often expected to participate in class, e.g. by raising their hands (Macintyre et al., 1998). As being able to reply in short replies does not require much spontaneous or creative thinking, the pupils could perhaps concentrate on expressing their will to participate instead of having to concentrate on long and difficult structures. This way the pupils were thus able to show how they express their *(good) pupil self*. The learners' identities in the

instances above cannot directly be said to influence the learner's WTC in the L2, but it seems that identities may be connected to whether or not the learners show WTC or un-WTC in the L2.

The pupils were also instructed to do an exercise in English in which they had the beginning of a sentence on a book page and they had to choose from a box a correct symptom that fitted the provided sentence. By researcher's own experience after having taught the same book that this study's participants study, it can be said that this type of exercise is a typical exercise in this book series, which means that the pupils are most likely accustomed to this type of exercise. Therefore, they know what to expect as well as what is expected of them; in other words, the pupils know what the expectations of *pupils* are regarding this exercise and identify themselves accordingly. During the exercise, the pupils spoke in the L2. Again, the only exception to the language of communication during this exercise was when the pupils met a problem: instead of asking from the teacher, the pupils turned to their partner and asked them in L1 about the problem. E.g. the following conversation occurred during this activity:

(9) Pupil Z: *"Mitä on 'rash'?"* ('What is rash?')
Pupil W: *"Se on ihottuma."* ('It's rash.')

This example presents an excerpt between two pupils who discuss in their L1 how the word 'rash' in English translates into Finnish. The example shows three things. The first is that when the pupils encountered a problem or an unfamiliar word, they did not ask a clarification from their teacher, but from their partner instead, and they did this in L1. Problematic situations thus connect to the learners' WTC in so that the learners seem to be willing to communicate in their L1 rather than in the L2 when they have to spontaneously ask for clarifications. The second observation is that the pupils seem to be willing to communicate in L2 if they have been provided with prompting questions which guide the pupils' own thinking, and which can be connected with the correct counterpart, similarly to what has been discussed previously.

The third aspect to note is that when turning to ask clarifications from the peers, the pupils seem to prefer their L1. As discussed above in section 4.1., this may partly be because the cognitive language of the pupils in this particular data is their L1 (Finnish), and problematic issues have primarily been solved in L1. It seems therefore understandable that when the pupils encounter a problem, they begin solving it in their L1. This can perhaps partly be accounted for the fact that the pupils are making sense of the task and the important terminology required in performing the task and are thus translating the idioms for better understanding. On the other hand, perhaps the pupils' use of their L1 in the example above can also partly be accounted for how the pupils identify

themselves in situations that are similar to this kind: as they are making sense of the task in their mutual L1, they seem to be preparing for the task *as themselves* which here means that they speak in their mother tongue. After they have come to terms with what the specific idioms and words in the exercise mean, they seem to be able to proceed to performing the task *as pupils*, as the pupils perhaps know that by participating in the classroom activities they can show their *pupil* identity.

4.5. Group Work (IT4b) and Learners' WTC

In this data, the pupils did not engage in group work apart from translating a new chapter from English into Finnish in 15 minutes. They were assigned to do this task in small groups, but this was the only example of group work that occurred in the data. The researcher did not have a chance to observe all of the groups that translated the text in the hallway, but she observed one of the four groups, and in that group each group member participated. However, the majority of communication between the members was in their L1. A reason for that might be the fact that the groups were allowed to work in the hallway where the teacher was not there to observe them. The pupils may have felt freer to communicate in their L1 when the teacher was not in sight, which naturally has an effect on the language of communication. Further, the pupils in the above example have possibly spoken to each other as themselves (i.e. they identified to the situation as themselves; as teenagers who speak Finnish as their L1), and because the teacher was not monitoring the conversation, perhaps the pupils felt no reason to speak in English (L2) and to try and appear as *pupils*.

I have regarded group work as a task that involves three or more pupils working on a same goal. Pair work is not included in this category, because both of the pupils working in the assigned pair work are to communicate on some level, and there is only a small possibility of one pupil of the two not participating at all. However, if pupils engage in group work with three or more members, there is a bigger possibility of one or more pupils remaining as the passive member and not participating in the task. Therefore, group work is regarded as a category of its own and discussed here, whereas pair work as a category has not been discussed separately, but rather within the other ITs (IT1-IT4a).

4.6. Unfamiliar Settings and Learners' WTC

In addition to van Lier's Interaction Types (1988), other categories emerged in the analysis. One was unfamiliar settings. An example of how unfamiliar settings according to the data seemed to

connect to the pupils' willingness to communicate is when one student was asked to go to the front of the classroom to mime a symptom without words. This type of task appeared to be new to the pupils because of what the teacher said:

(10) *"Tehdään tämä seuraava harjoitus eri tavalla kuin yleensä"* ('Let's do the next exercise in a different way than usual.')

Here, the teacher instructed an exercise saying they would do the exercise in a different way than what they were accustomed to, indicating that this time, the exercise type would not be familiar to the pupils. One student was asked to go to the front, while the others remained seated and were to guess in English what type of illness the person in the front was miming. Those who remained seated at their desks were allowed to have their books opened on the page which had the appropriate vocabulary and were able to look for the corresponding illness in the book. The person in the front, for example, held his hands on his stomach and crouched, to which one of the pupils said:

(11) *"Onkse 'I feel sick'?"* ('Is it 'I feel sick'?')

The one who was to guess the illness looked at his book and then said the line above. It can be seen that having access to vocabulary helped the particular pupil in communicating in the L2, but at the same time, it seems that he was unsure whether it was correct and expressed his uncertainty in his L1 by saying 'onkse' (*'is it'*). It may therefore be another indication of the fact that EFL learners are willing to communicate in the L2 if given access to vocabulary, but they may also feel unwilling or choose not to communicate in the L2 if a problem occurs. In problematic situations, this pupil, like many of his peers, used his L1 to express uncertainty.

The example presented above may be related to how the pupils identify themselves in the unfamiliar situation. The settings were new both to the pupil in the front and to the ones sitting at their desks. The pupil in the front did not have to communicate verbally, but the ones sitting were required to if they wished to participate in the task. Those who did communicate said the corresponding illness in L2, but if a problem occurred (such as in the example above in which the pupil was unsure whether his answer was correct or not), the pupils communicated in their L1. Behind this may lie a fact which is twofold: Firstly, he may have felt that in order to be perceived as a good pupil, he would have to participate and present himself situationally as a *pupil* by participating in L2. At the same time, however, he may have been unsure of his answer and wanted to express this by his L1 remark 'onkse' (*'is it'*) as if to soften the embarrassment if the answer had been wrong. In the latter case, the pupil may have spoken as *himself*, thus bringing forth his self

rather than *the pupil* or *the language learner* (Zimmerman, 1998), in case of which the pupil might have chosen to communicate solely in the L2.

Another instance of this type occurred when one of the pupils (in the other group) was asked to come to the front of the classroom to ask in Finnish some of the words on a vocabulary list of the text they were studying at that moment. The students who remained seated were to say the corresponding word in English and were allowed to have their books open on the table. The sitting pupils said the corresponding words in English throughout the exercise, whereas the person in the front asked the teacher in Finnish:

(12) *"Sanonko mää kaikki nää sanat?"* ('Shall I say all these words?', referring to the vocabulary list of illnesses).

To this the teacher replied in English:

"You don't have to if you don't want to."

The pupil in the front then replied:

"No oon aika sekasin jo mitä oon sanonu" ('Well I've kinda lost track of what I've already said'),

to which the teacher finally said in English:

"Okay, thank you X. You may go back to your seat."

This example presents an excerpt between the teacher and the student in the front. In this example the pupil in the front asked in Finnish (L1) for a clarification to a problem and continued to speak in Finnish even though the teacher herself spoke in English (the L2). On the other hand, the pupils who remained at their desks and had their books opened on a page that provided appropriate vocabulary seemed to be willing to communicate in the L2. This instance, like a few others above, seems to show that the pupils are do not show willingness to communicate in the L2 if they have to spontaneously communicate in a problematic situation, even if the teacher her-/himself speaks in English. Furthermore, it can again in this instance be seen that WTC in the L2 increases if the pupil has access to supporting vocabulary or to prompting questions to which they can turn to if they feel unsure of a phrase or a word in the L2.

In relation to the pupils' identities in this example, the prevailing dynamics of the classroom seem crucial here. As discussed in sections 4.2., the teacher is often the one in control of the organisation and course of the classroom, and the pupils are those who adjust and obey (Richards, 2006). These

power relations of the classroom are often accepted by all parties (van Lier, 2007). Therefore, even though the pupil in the example above was temporarily given the responsibility to lead the exercise by coming to the front and asking words as the teacher (thus making the pupil's situated identity *the assistant teacher;* Zimmerman, 1998), the pupil may nevertheless have felt that the teacher who had stepped aside for the duration of the exercise was in charge of the overall performance of the task, which is indicated by the following lines said by the pupil: *"Sanonko mää kaikki nää sanat?"* ('Shall I say all these words?') as well as *"No oon aika sekasin jo mitä oon sanonu"* ('Well I've kinda lost track of what I've already said'). These lines were addressed to the teacher, even though the pupil could have taken full charge of the task and proceeded to ask as many questions as the pupil himself wished to. However, the pupil chose to turn to the teacher to clarify the number of words he should ask the other pupils, again identifying himself as the pupil rather than the assistant teacher (making his situated identity the pupil; Zimmerman, 1998).

This seems to reflect the teacher-led power relations prevailing in the classroom at that particular time: the teacher is the one to decide the organisation of the class and of the exercise described above, and the pupils should follow this organisation (van Lier, 2007; Richards, 2006). The pupils seem to adapt to this distribution of power even if one pupil is temporarily given the possibility to take charge of the organisation of the task, as can be seen in the above example: the pupil asked some of the words in the vocabulary list and acted as the assistant teacher for the pupils remaining seated, as was instructed, but he also turned to the teacher when he felt unsure of how to proceed, indicating that when turning to the teacher, he still considered the teacher to be in charge instead of taking the responsibility himself and expressed his uncertainty *as himself*.

4.7. Learners' Language of Communication

As can be seen in the discussion above, the pupils communicated in their mutual L1 when a problematic or an unfamiliar situation occurred. The data showed that the pupils preferred to communicate in their L1 rather than in the L2 e.g. in situations where a pupil was unsure of vocabulary or the instructions of the given task (*"Nii mitä tässä piti tehä?"* ('So what were we supposed to do here?')). In these situations, the pupils without exception communicated in their L1, even if the teacher herself replied in the L2. The data also showed that the pupils often turned to their peers in problematic situations, e.g. when a pupil needed confirmation on a task or to clarify the meaning of a phrase or word: "*Onkse 'I feel sick'?*" ('Is it 'I feel sick'?'). This is important regarding the topic of this study, as the pupils seem unwilling or choose not to communicate in the

L2 if a situation requires spontaneous clarification or problem solving, or, more broadly, making sense of the task.

The next sections present a rough division of the ITs that seemed to have a positive connection to the learners' WTC, and those that seemed to have a limiting connection to WTC. By using the terms *positive* and *limiting* I do not indicate that what the participants did is *right* or *wrong*, nor do I mean that there is a certain standard of WTC that either increases or decreases; instead, the terms *positive/limiting* and *increase/decrease* are used as mechanical terms to clarify the distinction between the instances in which the participants used L2 and showed WTC, and the instances in which the participants did not use L2 nor showed WTC.

Regarding the first research question, i.e. *discovering what role Interaction Types have in EFL learners' WTC in the target language*, the analysis of the field notes shows that Interaction Types do indeed connect to the EFL learners' Willingness to Communicate in the L2 of the lesson, some positively (i.e. increasing visible WTC in the L2) and others in a limiting way (i.e. decreasing visible WTC in the L2 and increasing WTC in the L1, instead). Those ITs that positively connect to WTC, i.e. ITs that seem to make pupils willing to communicate in the L2, are IT3 (elicitation) and IT4a (ritual) (van Lier, 1988). More specifically, aspects within those interaction categories that seem to increase 9th-graders' WTC are access to supporting vocabulary or prompting questions in the L2, familiar type of activity format, questions which require only one- or two-word replies, possibility to self-select oneself to communicate in *Q–A–C*-type of activities, teacher's allocation of turns to specific speaker as well as time to prepare oneself to communicate. On the other hand, the primary ITs limiting WTC in the L2 are IT1 (conversation), and IT4b (group work). Within these categories emerged specific aspects that seem to decrease learners' WTC in the L2. These aspects are an unfamiliar type of activity, having to communicate spontaneously as well as problematic situations and uncertainty. A few other interesting aspects to consider also emerged in the analysis, namely the language of communication between the pupils as well as the person to whom the pupils prefer to turn in need of assistance. This paper's second research question, i.e. *tentatively suggest reasons behind EFL pupils' WTC in the target language by analysing learners' changing identities* (2), will be dealt with among the discussion of the first research question.

4.8. Aspects that Increased Willingness to Communicate

The analysis showed that learners' WTC in the L2 is indeed related to by multiple aspects. Those ITs that positively connected to WTC were IT3 (elicitation) as well as IT4a (ritual) (van Lier, 1988). These categories tie participants (here pupils) to certain communicative rules, of which predetermined order of participation (in cases where the teacher selects the speaker from those who raised their hands) as well as allocation of turns to a specific speaker belong to IT3 (van Lier, 1988). When the order of participation was predetermined, i.e. in instances where the teacher asks an open, undirected question, the pupils self-select themselves as speakers by raising their hands and the teacher then selects one pupil to speak, the pupils showed WTC in the L2. WTC in the L2 seemed to be particularly high (i.e. many pupils raised their hands; Macintyre et al., 1998) when the expected reply was short and simple, often one or two words. This may be an indication of the fact that the pupils are willing to communicate in the target language if the response does not require a long and spontaneous reply. In terms of the pupils' identities, it could be that because the pupils very likely know what being a 'good' student or a 'good' language learner in a classroom in the context of IT3 entails (i.e. participating actively by raising one's hand and replying to the teacher's question, for example). Considering that the expected reply was short and simple, the pupils could concentrate on expressing their *pupil* or *language learner* self instead of concentrating on the content of a long and complex sentence, for instance. In other words, if the pupils feel that being able to reply in short replies does not require much spontaneous or creative thinking, the pupils could perhaps better concentrate on expressing their will to participate instead of having to concentrate on long and difficult structures, and were thus able to show how they express their *(good) pupil/language learner self*.

Furthermore, teacher's questions in the form of *Q–A–C* (Ko, 2013) often require fast reactions from the pupils, i.e. a reply is expected as soon as possible (Bernales, 2016). As the pupils often need time to process what they want to say in the L2 which is not their L1, asking questions that require only short replies eliminates the time the pupils need to process and articulate the message in the L2 (Bernales, 2016, p. 10). One of the primary reasons behind pupils' increased WTC in the L2 may thus be self-selection to communicate, especially in the cases in which the pupil has the possibility to reply in short and straightforward replies. Another aspect behind pupils' WTC in the L2 may be related to the pupils' identities: short, often one- or two-word replies may give the pupils a possibility to participate in a way that does not require difficult sentence structures, and this may, in turn, provide the pupil with confidence which then may lead the pupil to the decision to participate and communicate in the L2.

Regarding allocation of turns to a specific speaker, the pupils also showed WTC in the L2 if the required reply was simple and short, similar to predetermined order of participation in the case of open, undirected questions in the form of *Q–A–C* (discussed above; Ko, 2013). The reasons behind learners' WTC in the L2 in these cases may also lie in the possibility to answer with short replies, as it eliminates the time the pupils need to articulate thoughts in the L2 (Bernales, 2016, p. 10). Another reason behind learners' WTC in the L2 in cases where the turn is allocated to a specific speaker is that the pupils may feel fear of losing one's face if they decide not to answer (Hashemi, 2011). Fear of embarrassment may therefore be a driving force for pupils who choose to communicate when the teacher calls upon the particular pupil.

Fear of embarrassment may also be connected to the pupils' identities in the given situations. If the teacher calls upon a particular pupil, she is made to make a quick choice either to reply or not to reply. Crucially related to this is that the pupil does not have time to assess whether or not they consider themselves ready to communicate, and that allocation of turns also eliminates the possibility to self-select oneself. When a teacher allocates the turn, then, the situation is unexpected (i.e. similar to that of spontaneous problems). This may make the pupil feel that a reply is expected shortly. The pupil may also feel that teacher is testing the pupil's language skills, i.e. the pupil would be speaking as *herself* rather than as a *pupil* or *a language learner*, especially since the pupil has to reply in front of the peers, who most likely consider the person as *herself* at that moment. Possibly this may make the pupil willing to invest on communicating in the L2 as herself (Norton & Toohey, 2011), and to choose to reply rather than not to reply and that way lose face in front of the peers, as herself.

The choice to reply when called upon is perhaps further reinforced by the fact that all of the pupils in the classroom are very likely to be accustomed to the rules of this interaction type, as it occurred multiple times in the data. The pupil to whom the turn was allocated may find it reassuring that most of the pupils in the classroom know the rules, i.e. they know that the pupil who was called upon might have not expected her turn, was perhaps caught by surprise, has little time to articulate and is expected an answer shortly. Because of this, she may find that answering incorrectly is more acceptable in a situation where the pupil was not allowed to self-select in comparison to instances where the pupil self-selected, i.e. considered his answer correct or adequate, and then discovers that the reply was, somehow, incorrect or inadequate. The pupils may feel that the latter is far more embarrassing than replying incorrectly when s/he did not have time to assess his/her reply and self-select. Choosing to reply and possibly answering incorrectly may, in other words, be the better option in comparison to choosing not to reply at all and losing face in front of the classmates.

Regarding IT4a (ritual), regular conversational rules do not apply in the same way as they do in IT3. As explained by van Lier (1988), the participants in IT3 are to respect the interaction order which the teacher selects and not to interrupt the person who has been selected as the speaker. The pupil who wishes to add something is expected to raise their hand and wait until the selected person has spoken. However, in IT4a, the regular conversational rules have been replaced by the constraints of the ritual activity. (van Lier, 1988) In the data of this paper, for example, the pupils were tied to the rules of replying in chorus when the teacher spread her arms (which may encourage the pupils to communicate, as they can do it in chorus without being put in a spotlight), and they were also tied to the rules of waiting for their turn to translate the assigned sentences in the new text (which may encourage communication in the L2 as they had time to prepare for the communication). At the same time, each individual was expected to participate in the task (translating), which seemed to work well, as each pupil actually participated. What seemed to be crucial in these types of activities is that *the pupils knew what they were expected to do*: they were able to mentally prepare for the upcoming task because they had done this type of activity before and they knew what was to come. They were also able to prepare for their turn to speak as they were respecting the rules of this activity format and waiting for the others to finish (van Lier, 1988; Bernales, 2016). One possibility related to WTC is that by knowing what they were expected to do and how, the pupils were able to prepare themselves for, lending terminology from Norton and Toohey, *investing* on expressing their *pupil* self. In other words, they were able to identify themselves to the particular task and situation as pupils as well as invest on showing the teacher how they act as pupils. (Norton & Toohey, 2011) In this study, the role of IT4a in learners' WTC in the L2 is therefore rather evident: whenever the activity or task that the pupils are to engage in is familiar to them, i.e. the structure of the task as well as the rules applying during that task are familiar, the pupils seem know what is expected of them as pupils, and participate and communicate in the target language of the lesson, with the one exception of problematic situations which shall be discussed later. In other words, familiarity of the activity appears to give pupils time to prepare for communicating in the L2 (i.e. expressing their pupil self) and increase EFL learners' WTC in the L2. Further, crucially related to familiarity of the activity is that learners' WTC in the L2 also seems to increase when they are given time to prepare for the communication in the L2.

In addition to the Interaction Types, other aspects emerged in the analysis. These aspects emerged within the interaction categories, but they were found to increase 9th-graders' WTC and will therefore be discussed as separate entities. These aspects were access to supporting vocabulary or prompting questions in the L2, and time to prepare for the communication in the L2.

Regarding access to supporting vocabulary and prompting questions in the L2, the analysis provided evidence that the pupils' willingness to communicate increased if they were given access to supporting vocabulary or questions in the L2. The role of vocabulary in WTC has been noted by Pawlak and Mystkowska-Wiertelak, who write that WTC may indeed depend on access to "necessary vocabulary" (2015, p. 3). In their study, the students were found to abandon their intention to communicate when they noticed that they did not have "sufficient (…) resources to verbalize [their] views" in the L2 (Pawlak & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, 2015, p. 7). This supports the findings in the present study, as the pupils were given appropriate vocabulary to support their verbalization, and it indeed increased their communication, which can be regarded as indication of willingness to communicate.

As for time to prepare for the task in the L2, the pupils in this study showed willingness to communicate when they were given enough time to prepare for the coming task or turn to speak. Findings are in line with Bernales' findings on WTC, as she discovered that "processing time needed to produce L2 speech" ensures increased WTC in the L2 (Bernales, 2016, 10). In this present study, the pupils went outside of the classroom for 15 minutes to translate the text from English to Finnish in small groups before translating the new text. After they returned to the classroom, the pupils took turns to translate the respectively assigned sentences, which is regarded as communicating in the L2 and thus indicating WTC (further discussed in section 4.4). It can therefore be seen that learners show WTC in the L2 if they are given enough time to prepare for communication in the L2.

4.9. Aspects that Decreased Willingness to Communicate

In comparison to the aspects that increased WTC in the L2, the primary ITs decreasing learners' WTC were IT1 (conversation), and IT4b (group work) (van Lier, 1988). Regarding IT1 (conversation), the pupils were, in fact, instructed to discuss in the L2 what they had heard from a tape, but as far as the researcher could observe, not one pupil did this. Instead, they turned to their peers to ask in their mutual L1 what they were to do in the exercise, and to quickly memorise in L1 what they had heard. The data and analysis thus suggest that conversation (IT1) rarely occurs in the L2, but rather in their mutual L1. This is in contrast with for example Bernales' (2016) findings, as she discovered that an activity in which the students freely discussed their spare time seemed to improve students' language skills and increase their WTC in the L2, whereas this data shows that the pupils do not engage in conversation in the L2. However, the difference between the conversational activity of Bernales' study participants and the conversational activity of the

participants in this study is the topic. In Bernales' study, the students were allowed to discuss a topic of their choice (2016), while in this present study, the pupils discussed a topic determined by the teacher. This may have influenced the pupils' WTC, perhaps because they lacked appropriate terminology in order to discuss the given topic (a conversation between a doctor and a patient), or perhaps because they simply found it easier to speak in their mutual L1, especially because the teacher did not monitor the conversations (an aspect which also affects WTC according to Pawlak and Mystkowska-Wiertelak (2015)) and the pupils could speak to each other in their mutual L1. Whatever the reason may be, the pupils in this study nevertheless engaged in conversation (IT1) only in their L1, which means their WTC in the L2 decreased in cases where spontaneous conversation (IT1) in the L2 was expected and when the teacher did not supervise the conversation. It cannot, however, directly be interpreted that van Lier's interaction type 1 per se decreases learners' WTC.

When discussing IT1 (conversation), it seems appropriate to also discuss the pupils' changing identities in the conversational task described above. The teacher instructed the class to discuss the topic in the L2, which may indicate that the pupils should have situationally identified themselves in the activity as *pupils* or *language learners* (Zimmerman, 1998). However, the pupils did not discuss the topic in the L2, but rather hastily in their L1, which potentially indicates that the pupils brought forth their *selves* in the exercise and spoke as themselves, a classmate to a classmate, a peer to peer, either asking clarifications from a peer, or otherwise talking to another peer. The two pupils described in an example in section 4.1. spoke in the L2, which indicates that they did not see themselves as, for example, language learners or language users in the situation, but rather as two classmates making sense of the task in their mutual L1.

In relation to IT4b, the pupils also showed unwillingness to communicate in the L2. Group work is here regarded as work that involves three or more members, whereas pair work is excluded from this category (discussed in section 4.5). The data provided a limited number of instances of group work, which means the results cannot be generalised. However, the one example provided important aspects to consider, and it is thus worth discussing.

In this data, the pupils engaged in group work by translating a new chapter from English into Finnish in 15 minutes. They were assigned to do this task in small groups in the hallway. The researcher did not have a chance to observe all of the groups that translated the text in the hallway, but in the group that was observed, each group member participated. However, the majority of communication between the members was in their mutual L1. The example did not show WTC in the L2, which is why IT4 is included in the category of aspects that decrease learners' WTC in the

L2. In relation to the second research question, one reason for the pupils' unwillingness to communicate in the L2 in this instance might be the fact that the groups were allowed to work in the hallway where the teacher was not present to observe them. As discussed by Pawlak and Mystkowska-Wiertelak, the teacher's presence may affect learners' WTC (2015), and in this case, the effect may have been that the pupils have felt freer to communicate in their L1 rather than in their L2 because the teacher was not in sight to supervise the communication within the group. This seems to be essentially connected to the learners' identities: because the pupils worked in the hallway without the teacher's presence, they may have found no reason to situationally identify themselves as pupils (Zimmerman, 1998) or to express their pupil/language learner self to the peers. Instead, the pupils may have spoken to and worked with each other as themselves, talking as a teenager to another teenager in their mutual L1 in the group task. Thus, to answer both research question (1) and (2), the teacher's absence may have affected learners' WTC in the L2 in so that the pupils have felt less pressure to express their pupil self (situational identity; Zimmerman, 1998) by communicating in the L2 and have therefore preferred to speak as themselves their L1 in this example of group work (IT4).

Similar with the categories that increased WTC, categories outside van Lier's Interaction Types emerged also within the ITs that decreased WTC in the L2. These aspects were unfamiliar type of activity (1), problematic situations and uncertainty (2), as well as having to communicate spontaneously (3), categories which all seem to intertwine and be connected with one another.

The first separate entity decreasing WTC in the L2 was unfamiliar type of activity (1). This aspect leads to the second and third separate entity as shall shortly be discussed, and it relates to WTC in that the rules and expectations of unfamiliar types of activities are not known to the pupils. Not knowing the rules as well as what to expect caused problematic situations (2) in which the pupils were required to spontaneously communicate in the target language (3). It can be seen in the analysis that pupils who confront problematic situations requiring spontaneous use of the L2 are unwilling to communicate in the L2 and communicate in the L1 instead. This can be seen e.g. in the activity in which one of the pupils went to the front of the classroom to mime an illness or a symptom. Other examples of unwillingness to spontaneously communicate in the L2 in problematic situations are pupils' comments such as:

(1) *"Nii mitä tässä piti tehä?"* ('So what were we supposed to do here?'),

(3) *"Ai hä?"* ('Eh what?'), and

(9) *"Mitä on 'rash'?"* ('What is rash?'),

(11) *"Onkse 'I feel sick'?"* ('Is it 'I feel sick'?'),

(12) *"Sanonko mää kaikki nää sanat?"* ('Shall I say all these words?).

All of the instances above suggest that the pupils are unwilling to communicate in the L2 and prefer their L1 when a problem occurs and they have to overcome it. They either express uncertainty of a phrase said in the L2 (11) or uncertainty of the situation (1), ask for a translation (9) or clarify the instructions of a task from their partner (3). What connects all these instances is that they require spontaneous communication when a problem emerges, and in the present data, they all occurred in the pupils' L1 (Finnish). This seems to support the finding that pupils' WTC in the L2 decreases when the pupils confront a problematic situation in which spontaneous communication is required. In this data, problems were solved in the pupils' L1, even in cases where the pupil asks for a clarification directly from the teacher (12).

The reasons behind preference of L1 in challenging situations may lie in the fact that the pupils' cognitive language is their L1, and the pupils most likely use this language to solve spontaneous problems in all other situations. As e.g. Vivian Cook (2001) explains, the cognitive language of learners in foreign language classes is often the learners' L1 (here Finnish). Often, it is also the language in which unexpected or sudden problems are solved everywhere else (Cook, 2001). Spontaneous problem solving in learners' L1 may thus have become automatic; it may be challenging for EFL learners to suddenly find resources in a foreign language in situations which require fast reactions. And because the pupils in this data express their sense of self in the L1, it is likely that also their cognitive language is the L1. Therefore, in situations which require spontaneous communication and problem solving, the pupils may automatically speak as themselves and, thus, in their L1 rather than as the pupil by communicating in the L2. This may be the cause of the preference to use L1 in problematic situations shown by this study's participants (research question 2). This may also help in explaining why the pupils show uncertainty of vocabulary choices, fear of embarrassment/losing one's face, or overall frustration of not being able to complete a task in the L2 and why they choose to communicate in the L1 instead. As e.g. Macintyre and Bernales suggest, WTC is indeed a dynamic system that fluctuates due to various contextual and social aspects (Bernales, 2016; Macintyre, 2007). This study shows that the decision to communicate either in the learner's L2 or in the L1 is influenced by a combination of cumulative

aspects. If the pupil feels that s/he does not have the L2 tools to proceed in the challenging situation, it seems natural that they turn to their L1.

In addition to problematic, spontaneous situations, the language of communication between the pupils in other situations in the classroom was interesting to observe. Without an exception, the pupils in this data communicated with each other in their mutual L1 when they discussed a topic outside the topic of the lesson or the assigned task. This occurred throughout both lessons that I observed, in instances such as

(2) *"No alota sää"* ('Well you go first'),
(13) *"Mitä ihmettä?"* ('What on earth?'; one pupil's comment to another),

as well as multiple occasions where the pupils chatted about TV shows, films and make-up when waiting for next instructions from the teacher. These were all in the pupils' L1, with the exception of one pupil's comment that was said in the middle of an otherwise L1 conversation: one of the pupils had told another about a TV show she had watched, and the other pupil replied in a mocking tone:

(14) *"Excuse me?!"*

Example 14 was the only comment said in the L2, while all other mundane topics that were not related to the topic of the lesson were discussed in the pupils' L1. The pupils' preference of L1 in communications between each other may result from the fact that the pupils are accustomed to speaking to and with each other in their L1 during the breaks between lessons as well as in all other lessons apart from language lessons. Outside the language classroom and especially during the breaks when the pupils interact freely with each other, they may be speaking as themselves about subjects that reflect the interests of their selves (Norton & Toohey, 2011). Furthermore, when the pupils in a language classroom then engage in conversations outside the topic of the lesson (i.e. mundane topics), the pupils are likely to speak, chat and discuss as themselves (Norton & Toohey, 2011). This may influence the pupils' WTC in the L2 in so that they feel uncomfortable or awkward when they suddenly have to communicate in another language than their first language, knowing very well that all the peers speak Finnish (L1). Thus, the contradiction between the preferred language of communication in language classes and the language of communication elsewhere may be one of the reasons why pupils feel uncomfortable or even unwilling to communicate in the L2.

As for the last, not yet discussed interaction type (IT2; telling), the pupils seemed to conform to the rules of the interaction type, i.e. they respected the teacher and listened silently to what she said

about grammar or how she instructed tasks (van Lier, 1988). In addition, the pupils did not ask for clarifications after the teacher's instructions in this data, apart from one instance where one student was in the front miming an illness and was unsure how many of the listed illnesses he was to mime. The minimal communication during IT2 means there was little communication to analyse, and what can be gathered of this phenomenon is that IT2 neither increases or decreases learners' WTC in the L2. However, one interesting aspect arose from these types of interactions, namely the fact that the pupils turned to their peers instead of their teacher to ask for clarifications and assistance. This always occurred in the pupils' L1, as has been discussed in section 4. The pupils asked e.g.

(1) *"Nii mitä tässä piti tehä"* ('So what were we supposed to do here'),

which suggests that the pupils prefer to turn to their peers in need of assistance. In relation to the second research question, i.e. identity, this may result from the fact that the pupils are not accustomed to communicating spontaneously in the L2, or from the fact that they do not know how to verbalise in the L2 what they wish to say (Pawlak & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, 2015), both of which may, in turn, result from the fact that the pupils, when speaking as themselves (Norton & Toohey, 2011), are accustomed to communicating in the L1. From another perspective, the pupils are making sense of the task, and when doing so, they seem to prefer their mutual L1, perhaps because they are not accustomed to or do not have the resources to solve problematic situations as the pupils, i.e. by communicating in the L2. Thus, the preferred language of communication in a language classroom, even between the teacher and the pupil, is the L2 (Bernales 2016; Opetushallitus, 2014, p. 350). In summary, the data does not provide evidence of IT2 (telling) either positively or in a limiting way influencing WTC in the L2. It does, however, indicate that the pupils seem more willing to communicate in their L1 when asking for clarifications from their peers, which, in turn, reflects that in problematic situations, the pupils prefer their L1 (the cognitive language) to the L2, as the L1 is the language in which the pupils outside the classroom, i.e. as themselves, are accustomed to communicating.

Below, Table 1 presents the relationship of different Interaction Types and identities presents during those ITs as well as the language that was primarily used. The table was drawn according to the results presented in this section.

Table 1. *The relationship of Interaction Types, Identities and Language*

Interaction Type	**Social Identity**	**WTC in the L1**	**WTC in the L2**
1 – Conversation	Self	x	
2 – Telling	Not visible	Not visible	Not visible
3 – Elicitation	Pupil		x
4a – Ritual	Pupil		x
4b – Group Work	Self	x	
Unfamiliar settings	Self	x	

5. Discussion

In this section, the results of the analysis will be discussed and potential practical implications for language teachers will be provided. Lastly, the trustworthiness of this paper as well as other considerations will be discussed.

5.1. Findings

Regarding research question 1, i.e. *what role ITs have in EFL learners' WTC in the L2,* learners' choice of language varied depending on which Interaction Type dominated, as presented in Table 1 in section 4. Within Interaction Types 3 and 4a (elicitation and ritual), the pupils showed Willingness to Communicate in the L2, particularly in situations where the pupils were (1) given access to supporting vocabulary, (2) provided with a possibility to self-select oneself as speaker, (3) provided with a possibility to communicate in short replies, (4) engaging in a familiar type of activity, or (5) given time to prepare for the communication. In addition, the language of communication appears to be connected to the pupils' identities during those interaction types. When the pupils showed WTC in the L2, the learners seemed to situationally identify themselves as pupils (Zimmerman, 1998). One possible reason behind this may be that the pupils know what type of activity is to come and they know what can be expected, both from the activity and from the learners. In turn, knowing the expectations facilitates preparing for and investing on the activity (Norton & Toohey, 2011) as well as eventually expressing their good pupil selves.

It cannot be concluded that in every pedagogical situation, elicitation and ritual (IT3 and IT4a) influence pupils' WTC in so that pupils always show WTC in the L2. Although the data in this study suggests this, it should be kept in mind that the decision whether or not to communicate in L2 is a complex and dynamic process in which many aspects influence the decision which may not even be a conscious one. Besides the pupil's visible signs of WTC, there are other aspects that influence the decision to communicate, and these aspects are not always visible, as Macintyre et al. note by saying that WTC "varies considerably over time and space" and that there are "linguistic, communicative, and social psychological variables" that may affect the decision to communicate (1998; p. 545). This means, among others, that it cannot assertively be said that the pupil is willing to communicate if only raising his hand or otherwise visibly showing his intentions to communicate. As Macintyre et al. write, the pupil may be very unwilling to communicate even if she is communicating, and vice versa (1998). Thus, to more thoroughly understand the phenomenon of communicating in a foreign language, more research is needed. Moreover, when discussing

research question 1, the analysis showed that although some ITs seem to encourage more L2 communication than others, it was the situational aspects (1–5 above) that seemed to more strongly connect to the pupils' WTC in the L2.

On the contrary, concerning Interaction types 1 and 4b, EFL learners in this school showed unwillingness to communicate in the L2 and preferred their L1, particularly in situations where (6) spontaneous conversation in the L2 was expected, (7) the type of activity was unfamiliar, or (8) a problematic situation required spontaneous problem solving in the L2. All of the situations listed here are somehow new and unexpected. As was the case with the ITs that positively connected to WTC in the L2, those ITs that seemed to have a decreasing effect on WTC in the L2 also seemed to have a connection to the learners' identities. Namely, in cases where the pupils did not show WTC in the language of the lesson but communicated in their L1 instead, the pupils appeared to communicate as themselves (Norton & Toohey, 2011). One of the possible explanations for this may be that, as Richards explains, investing on bringing forth and showing one's self is always a matter of emotions (2006). This means that when operating as one's self, the person is always, to some extent, emotionally invested. Therefore, exposing one's self to others (e.g. peers) and speaking as oneself can be an intimidating task even in one's first language, but doubly so if one is to communicate in a foreign language. Expressing oneself and communicating in a foreign language can thus involve a myriad of emotions, and it does not seem unlikely that one of the emotions when investing on expressing oneself as oneself is losing one's face in front of others, as Hashemi suggests (Hashemi, 2011). Another aspect closely related to the choice of language of communication in unexpected, spontaneous situations is that of cognitive language. As Cook (2001) explains, the cognitive language of learners is often the learners' L1 (here Finnish). Often, it is also the language in which unexpected or sudden problems are solved outside the classroom (Cook, 2001). Spontaneous problem solving in learners' L1 may thus have become automatic; it may be challenging for EFL learners to suddenly find resources to cope in a foreign language in situations which require fast reactions. And because the pupils in this data seem to express their sense of self in the L1, it is likely that also their cognitive language is the L1. Therefore, in situations which require spontaneous communication and problem solving, the pupils may automatically speak as themselves and, thus, in their L1 rather than as the pupil communicating in the L2.

In terms of IT2, telling, the data did not provide evidence of neither WTC in the L1 or in the L2. the students did not interrupt the teacher as she was instructing or teaching grammar, but neither did they ask for clarifications after the instructions, which implies that in this data, IT2 may have influenced the learners' WTC both in L2 and in L1 in so that they did not communicate in neither

language but chose to listen to the teacher. Similarly, the pupils' identities were not visible in IT2. However, WTC in the L1 occurred when the pupils turned to their peers to ask for clarifications, i.e. made sense of the task, and it seemed that the pupils identified themselves as peers when talking to themselves.

Behind these visible, *transparent* (van Lier, 1988) reactions to different situations and to (or within) different Interaction Types may also lie a number of very mundane reasons, as it is possible that the pupils themselves are not aware of their changing identities in different situations. These reasons can be confidence provided by supporting tools (1), certainty of a correct answer (2, 3), knowing what to expect and what is expected of them (4) and having enough time to articulate thoughts in the L2 (5), as well as not knowing what is to be expected or what is expected of the learners (7), and being accustomed to solving problems in the L1 and not having sufficient tools to solve a problem in the L2 (6, 8). The reasons behind learners' WTC in the L2 needs further investigation, as the results thus far are only tentative and subject to researcher's interpretations. They do, however, show that WTC is a holistic and dynamic situation affected by a variety of cumulative aspects, both social and contextual.

5.2. Practical Implications

In terms of the practical implications that can be drawn from the findings, the question of providing pupils with access to vocabulary appears the most significant. The results of the analysis showed that access to vocabulary increased pupils' WTC in the L2 in IT3 and IT4a. In terms of IT1 and IT4b, the pupils did not show WTC in the L2, but rather in their L1. This seems to have one rather important implication regarding encouraging more L2 use in a classroom. If the pupils in a language classroom are encouraged to communicate in the L2 in IT1 or IT4b but do not show willingness to do this (e.g. by communicating in their L1 instead), one possible solution towards an increased L2 use could be that the pupils are provided with access to appropriate vocabulary to assist them in their conversation or group work. According to the results presented in section 4, the pupils do indeed communicate more in the L2 if they have access to vocabulary, and perhaps this should be considered when discussing how to encourage more L2 use in language classrooms. Therefore, in instances where the pupils struggle to talk, chat, discuss or otherwise communicate in the L2, the teacher can consider showing some possibly useful vocabulary from the screen, for instance, or to allow the pupil to search for an appropriate word in their book or an online dictionary.

Access to vocabulary could potentially have the same effect on the pupil's learning as the expert in the theory of legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991). If no expert (either in the form of a teacher or a native speaker, for example) is available to assist (or merely talk with) the learner, then having access to vocabulary could be regarded as the assistant that guides and supports the learner as s/he learns the skills to strengthen his/her the L2. The same applies to other aspects that seem significant in terms of the pupils' WTC in the L2, such as imagined communities. Imagining belonging to a certain group or community (e.g. that of English language users) may motivate the pupil to invest on learning the language (Norton & Toohey, 2011), and, at the same time, serves as the inanimate expert (Lave & Wenger, 1991) supporting and guiding the pupil to learn more of the skills that are required in order for the pupil to become a member of the particular (language) group.

As can be seen from the results in section 4, the pupils also showed WTC in the L2 when they knew what type of activity was to come and had time to prepare for the coming task. This can be related to the pupils' identities and losing face. Namely, knowing what is to be expected may give the pupils either motivation to prepare, or in Norton and Toohey's words, motivation to *invest* on preparing for the task in advance. In turn, investing on the upcoming task may provide the pupils with confidence to perform the task in front of peers. Should one pupil not prepare in advance, s/he might feel uncomfortable with the task, and, in the fear of losing face in front of the peers, s/he might choose not to participate, i.e. s/he might show unwillingness to communicate (Hashemi, 2011). If having enough time to prepare for activities and tasks indeed encourages more L2 use, giving time to prepare in advance could therefore also aid the pupils in situations where they do not show WTC in the L2 even though L2 might have been expected or encouraged (such as spontaneous and problematic situations as well as making sense of the task). By for example letting pupils know the schedule of the lesson as well as providing the pupils with enough time to prepare for a task, the teacher could both ensure that the pupils know what is expected and what is expected of them, and limit the risk of spontaneous problems (which in this data limited WTC in the L2).

In other words, by allowing the pupils to prepare in advance, the pupils can, if they wish, search for appropriate vocabulary and thus prepare for expressing their good student self, for example. As discussed in section 4.8., the role of vocabulary in WTC has been noted by, among others, Pawlak and Mystkowska-Wiertelak, who discovered that WTC may depend on access to "necessary vocabulary" (2015, p. 3). They found that some students abandoned their intention to communicate when they noticed that they did not have "sufficient (…) resources to verbalize [their] views" in the L2 (Pawlak & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, 2015, p. 7). This indeed supports the findings in the present

study, as the pupils were given appropriate vocabulary to support their verbalization, and it indeed increased their communication (or visible WTC) in the L2.

On the other hand, giving time to prepare for a task limits the risk of spontaneous and problematic situations, which allows for a more relaxed and encouraging environment for the pupil to participate and may decrease pressure as well as the fear of losing one's face (Hashemi, 2011). Although it is important for pupils to practice how to cope with unexpected problems in the L2, it seems more important in comprehensive school to broaden vocabulary, get experience on and become invested in using the language rather than to train spontaneous conversations without adequate vocabulary or self-confidence, for instance. Hence, being able to prepare in advance not only broadens the pupils' vocabulary (which is of primary importance in comprehensive school), but it also creates a safe and encouraging atmosphere for the pupils to participate in the L2. The fear of losing one's face in front of the peers or the teacher may also decrease if the pupil has had the chance to prepare for the task in her own way.

Yet another rather significant implication stemming from the results regards the question of how the pupils make sense of the task as well as identify themselves in unexpected and problematic situations requiring spontaneous language use. In the data, the pupils made sense of a given task and solved a context-related problem in their mutual L1 (see e.g. section 4.1.), and they seemed to work as peers rather than as pupils or language learners when doing this. It could thus be that because Finnish is the pupils' L1 and therefore primarily their cognitive language which is essential to their selves, the pupils, perhaps subconsciously, use their L1 to make sense of a task and to clarify, to confirm, to urge or to signify uncertainty. Furthermore, the participants' selves appeared to come forth also when the participants confronted an unfamiliar, problematic situation which they verbally had to solve. In these instances, much like when making sense of a task, the pupils showed WTC in the L1 even if L2 was occasionally expected, e.g. regarding IT1 (conversation). Therefore, if the aim is to increase pupils' L2 use in classrooms as well as in the outside world, one rather important task is to increase opportunities for the pupils to strengthen the experience of authentic language use as well as the feeling of having the right to speak and use the language with exactly the language skills that they have.

The results also suggest that in situations where pupils prefer communicating in their L1 rather than in their L2 (IT1 and IT4b), they identify themselves as language learners rather than language users. On the contrary, L2 was used when the pupils knew how to "pupil", i.e. knew how to show their good pupil selves. Drawing on this, it appears that there is a gap between the pupils' selves and their situated identities when using the language. In cases where the pupils spoke as themselves (IT1 and

IT4b), they used L1, but when they knew that they should express their pupil selves (IT3 and IT4a), L2 was used. This seems to suggest that the pupils' sense of pupil identity is separate from their senses of self, i.e. the way the pupils identify themselves to using a foreign language in the classroom and outside is afar from their own selves: they seem to have two separate identities, themselves and their pupil selves, depending on which language they are to use. As this paper, drawing on current beliefs on sociocultural (language) learning (van Lier, 2002; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Vygotsky, 1962), suggests, language learning should not be considered having two separate languages at the ends of a continuum, one end being the mother tongue and the other the target language, the paper also suggests that it would perhaps be beneficial if the pupils learned that learning a language need not be separate from their own selves. Because the identity of language learners (i.e. pupils) appeared in the analysis to be the only identity type that seemed to encourage L2 use in the classroom, it seems important that the pupils also embraced language learning identities as part of their selves so that they would eventually identify themselves as language users. If the pupils learned and understood that one has the right to use a language with exactly the skills that they at a given moment have, and that their language skills need not and will not be compared to those of a native speaker, the pupils might find themselves encouraged to use the language as themselves, i.e. as language users rather than merely as language learners.

The question of language learner identity versus the pupil's sense of self might also be one of the most crucial questions to consider when discussing L2 teaching and learning. Learning to embrace the language user identity as part of the pupils' selves already at school might facilitate the language learners later when facing a situation in which they have to speak in English as themselves, e.g. in a real-life conversation with foreigners. As the schools in Finland are to provide the pupils with tools to communicate and interact appropriately in L2, both within the classroom and outside in the real world (Opetushallitus, 2014), it seems important that the language learners indeed learn to use the language outside in the real world where they cannot identify themselves as *pupils*. Namely, the pupils facing situations that require using English are not likely to consider themselves as language users, but, instead, they would very likely face the situation as themselves, and if the language user identity is not part of their selves, they are likely to face difficulties in expressing themselves. However, if the pupils felt that language use is part of who they are and that they have the right, as language users, to communicate in the language with the means they possess, no more or less, they could potentially find themselves encouraged to learn and use the language as themselves. Therefore, it seems appropriate that the language teacher somehow encourages the pupils not only to identify to the language as language learners, as is the case at the moment, but also to learn to

integrate the language use to their selves and become, as themselves, language users.

5.3. Other Considerations

It should to be noted that the data for this paper is rather limited. Two EFL lessons is not sufficient to present a holistic picture of how ITs affect learners' WTC in the L2 in Finnish comprehensive schools. More thorough investigation may be in order to fully comprehend the extent to which different types of interactional instances affect Finnish EFL learners' willingness to communicate in the target language of the lesson, as well as what 9th-graders themselves think of why, how and when they either communicate or choose not to communicate in the target language of the lesson. These questions shall be left for future studies. However, the data in this paper was limited to two 75-minute EFL lessons because I wished to understand more fully the complex and dynamic situation in which the decision either to communicate or not to communicate in the L2 is made and which is connected to different aspects. Limiting the data down to two lessons allowed me to deeply investigate the concept of WTC from different perspectives.

However, important to consider is the fact that the reasons behind pupils' WTC rely on the researcher's interpretations. As the study relies on studying the observable, i.e. what can be seen to occur in the classroom regarding WTC, the study cannot concludingly address the reasons behind WTC, i.e. what the pupils themselves think, but it can provide insight into the issue. In order to gain a more complete picture of how the pupils themselves feel about the issue, how aware of the phenomenon (WTC) they really are, and how conscious the decision (not) to communicate is, more research is needed. E.g. interviewing the pupils provides more insight into the matter and may bring more depth into the theory of WTC. The same applied to studying identity. This paper relies on the researchers' interpretations on potential situated identities that are present during interaction types. However, more research, possibly in the form of interviews and questionnaires, is needed to gain a more holistic and thorough picture of how identity is connected to the choice of language in the classroom. In addition, neither Zimmerman's discourse identities nor transportable identities (Zimmerman, 1998) appeared in the data. For this reason, this paper cannot discuss how these identity types possibly connect to the learner's choice of language.

Noteworthy is also the fact that the pupils in both groups of research participants acknowledged researcher's presence in the classroom. This may have affected the results, as WTC is a concept that fluctuates due to varied social aspects. One influencing aspect may have been shyness caused by the

presence of an unfamiliar person in the classroom, which in turn may have affected the visible WTC on which this paper relies.

Another aspect to consider is the concept of WTC. The concept *Willingness to Communicate* is relatively new and, as discussed in section 1, research on the field is needed in order to fully comprehend the implications of the concept, and that is what this present study aimed to contribute to. However, I see a subtle contradiction between the term *willingness* and the way language learning is regarded in this paper. If a learner decides to communicate, the decision (that others around the learner see as communication) is the product of a myriad of social, contextual and situational aspects, and by no means is it a straightforward line from the chance to communicate to communication, and by no means do I see that willingness is the sole deciding factor leading to communication, as also Macintyre et al. note (1998). The same applies in cases where the learner decides not to communicate. If a possibility to communicate arises, the learner's decision not to communicate may be affected by not only his/her willingness to communicate but also by other aspects such as peer pressure, embarrassment or lack of confidence in vocabulary or pronunciation. These individual aspects may eventually make the learner unwilling to communicate, but important here is to note that behind the learner's willingness or unwillingness to communicate may lie a number of different reasons. Furthermore, in some cases where the learner chooses not to communicate, the learner may have felt willing to communicate but for some reason has chosen not to communicate (Macintyre et al., 1998). The decision to communicate does not, therefore, always indicate willingness to communicate, and vice versa. Thus, I do not indicate that language learning and the decision to communicate is a simple matter in which the learner is either willing or unwilling to communicate, even though I use the term willingness to communicate (WTC). Like the issue of the concepts *increase* and *decrease* (see below), the concept *willingness to communicate* should perhaps be reformulated, as the decision to communicate in a classroom is not always a matter of willingness or unwillingness. I have, nevertheless, kept to using the term WTC throughout this paper for mechanical purposes as well as to tentatively suggest that perhaps *willingness* is not the most appropriate of terms to describe the dynamic process of communicating in and learning a language.

Finally, I have analysed the role of Interaction Types in WTC and used terms *increase* and *decrease* WTC. This implicitly assumes that there is a standard level of WTC, which is not in accordance with either the definition provided in this paper nor with the researcher's understanding of the concept, but it is a conceptual issue that will be addressed in further studies.

6. Conclusion

EFL learners' choice of language in this study seems to vary depending on which Interaction Type dominates in the language classroom. Within Interaction Types 3 and 4a (elicitation and ritual), the pupils seem to show Willingness to Communicate in the language of the lesson (L2; English). Within these specific interaction categories emerged situational varieties that appear to affect the choice of language and WTC, namely (1) access to supporting vocabulary, (2) possibility to self-select oneself as speaker, (3) possibility to communicate in short replies, (4) a familiar type of activity, and (5) time to prepare oneself for the communication. In addition, the language of communication appears to be connected to the pupils' identities during those interaction types. When the pupils show WTC in the L2, the learners seem to situationally identify themselves as *pupils*. One possible reason behind this may be that the pupils know what type of activity is to come and they know what can be expected, both from the activity and from them. In turn, knowing the expectations facilitates preparing for and investing on the activity as well as eventually expressing their good pupil selves.

Concerning Interaction types 1 and 4b, EFL learners in this school seem to show unwillingness to communicate in the L2 and prefer their mutual first language (L1; Finnish), particularly in situations where (6) spontaneous conversation in the L2 is expected, (7) the type of activity is unfamiliar, or (8) a problematic situation requires spontaneous problem solving in the L2. As was the case with the ITs that positively connected to WTC in the L2, those ITs that seem to have a decreasing effect on WTC in the L2 also seem to have a connection to the learners' identities: in cases where the pupils do not show WTC in the language of the lesson but communicate in their L1 instead, the pupils appear to communicate as *themselves*. One of the possible explanations for this may be that investing on bringing forth and showing one's self is always a matter of emotions. This means that when operating as one's self, the person is likely to be emotionally invested. Therefore, exposing one's self to others (e.g. peers) in a foreign language and speaking as oneself can be an intimidating task. Another aspect closely related to the choice of language of communication in unexpected, spontaneous situations is that of cognitive language. Cognitive language of learners is often the learners' L1 (here Finnish). Often, it is also the language in which unexpected or sudden problems are solved outside the classroom. Spontaneous problem solving in learners' L1 may thus have become automatic; it may be challenging for EFL learners to suddenly find resources to cope in a foreign language in situations which require fast reactions. Therefore, in situations which require spontaneous communication and problem solving, the pupils may automatically speak as themselves and, thus, in their L1.

There are some practical implications to draw from the tentative results. The first is providing pupils with access to vocabulary: the results of the analysis showed that access to vocabulary increased pupils' WTC in the L2 in IT3 (elicitation) and IT4a (familiar type of activity). In terms of IT1 (conversation) and IT4b (group work), the pupils did not show WTC in the L2, but rather in their L1. One possible solution towards an increased L2 use could thus be that the teacher shows some possibly useful vocabulary from the screen, or allows the pupil to search for an appropriate word in their book or an online dictionary in situations where the pupils struggle to talk, chat, discuss or otherwise communicate in the L2.

Another rather important implication seems to relate to the instances where pupils face problematic situations which require spontaneous language. The analysis suggests that pupils show willingness to communicate in the L2 when given enough time to prepare for the task. This may relate to knowing what is to be expected, which gives the pupils either motivation to prepare, or motivation to *invest* on preparing for an upcoming task in advance, as well as possibly decreases the fear of losing face. In turn, investing on the upcoming task may provide the pupils with confidence to perform the task in front of peers. Thus, letting pupils know the schedule of the lesson as well as providing the pupils with enough time to prepare for a task, the teacher can both ensure that the pupils know what is expected and what is expected of them, and limit the risk of spontaneous problems, which in this data limited WTC in the L2.

Finally, the pupils in this data appeared to make sense of a given task solely in their mutual L1 and not in L2. This may be accounted for the fact that outside the language classroom, the pupils are accustomed to interacting and communicating with peers as themselves, i.e. bringing forth their own selves. In other words, the pupils may be accustomed to communicating with each other in the L1, and, when the pupils in unexpected, problematic situations concerning the given task or activity communicate, it may come automatically and naturally to use their mutual L1 even in the language classroom. Further, as the pupils' first language is Finnish, it also very likely is their cognitive language, and it is probable that the pupils, without thinking, use their mutual L1 when communicating with each other. The pupils could even feel strange or pretentious to communicate in the L2, knowing that everyone in the class shares the first language.

Drawing on this, it appears that there is a gap between the pupils' selves and their situated identities when using the language. In cases where the pupils spoke as themselves (IT1 and IT4b), they used L1, but when they knew that they should express their pupil selves (IT3 and IT4a), L2 was used. This seems to suggest that the pupils' sense of pupil identity is separate from their senses of self, i.e. the way the learners identify themselves to using a foreign language in the classroom and outside is

afar from their own selves: they seem to have two separate identities, themselves and their pupil selves, depending on which language they are to use. This paper suggests that it would be beneficial for the pupils if the they learned that learning a language need not be separate from their own selves. Because the identity of language learners appeared in the analysis to be the only identity type that seemed to encourage L2 use in the classroom and in every other situation, the learners used their L1, it seems important that the pupils also embrace language learning identities as part of their selves. If the pupils learned and understood that one has the right to use a language with exactly the skills that they at a given moment have, and that their language skills need not and will not be compared to those of a native speaker, the pupils might find themselves encouraged to use the language as themselves, i.e. as language users rather than merely as language learners. Communication and language use is, however, a complex and dynamic matter, and the decision to communicate in a foreign language indeed seems to be connected to a variety of contextual, social and situational aspects. However, this paper investigated how communication in L2 appeared for an outsider who observed the visible cues related to the issue. To understand how pupils themselves think about communicating in a foreign language and how conscious they themselves are of their changing identities seems equally, if not even more, important, but it will be left for future studies.

7. List of References

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflection on the origin and spread of nationalism* (revised ed.). New York: Verso.

Angrosino, M. (2007). *Doing Ethnographic and Observational Research*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Baker, S. C. & Macintyre, P. D. (2000). The Role of Gender and Immersion in Communication and Second Language Orientations. *Language Learning, 50*(2), 311–341.

Bernales, C. (2016). Towards a comprehensive concept of Willingness to Communicate: Learners' predicted and self-reported participation in the foreign language classroom. *System, 56,* 1–12.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the First Language in the Classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*(3), 402–23.

Faez, F. (2011). Reconceptualizing the Native/Nonnative Speaker Dichotomy. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 10*(4), 231–249.

Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (1997). On Discourse, Communication, And (Some) Fundamental Concepts in SLA Research. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(3), 285–300.

Hashemi, M. (2011). Language Stress And Anxiety Among The English Language Learners. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 30*, 1811–1816.

House, J. (2003). English as a lingua franca: A threat to multilingualism? *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *7*(4). 556–578.

Kanno, Y. & Norton, B. (2010). *Imagined Communities and Educational Possibilities: A Special Issue of the journal of Language, Identity, and Education*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Ko, S. (2013). *Understanding the Dynamics of Classroom Communication*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leppänen, S. (2007). Youth language in media contexts: insights into the functions of English in Finland. *World Englishes, 26*(2). 149–169.

Macintyre, P. D., Dörnyei, Z., Clément, R. & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing Willingness to Communicate in a L2: A Situational Model of L2 Confidence and Affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal, 82*(4), 545–562.

Macintyre, P. D. (2007). Willingness to Communicate in the Second Language: Understanding the Decision to Speak as a Volitional Process. *Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 564-76.

Munezane, Y. (2015). Enhancing willingness to communicate: Relative effects of visualization and goal setting. *Modern Language Journal, 99*(1), 175–191.

Nasrollahi Shahri, M. N. (2018). Constructing a Voice in English as a Foreign Language: Identity and Engagement. *TESOL Quarterly, 52*(1), 85–109.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change.* Harlow: Pearson Education/Longman.

Norton, B. & Toohey, K. (2011). Identity, language learning, and social change. *Language Teaching, 44*(4), 412–446.

Opetushallitus (2010). *Merkkejä tulevaisuuden oppimisympäristöistä*. Vammalan Kirjapaino Oy.

Opetushallitus (2014). *Perusopetuksen Opetussuunnitelman perusteet*. Helsinki: Next Print Oy.

Pawlak, M. & Mystkowska-Wiertelak, A. (2015). Investigating the dynamic nature of L2 willingness to communicate. *System, 50*, 1–9.

"Perusopetus", (n.d.) *Opetushallitus – Utbildningsstyrelsen* [web]. Retrieved from: https://www.oph.fi/koulutus_ja_tutkinnot/perusopetus/103/0/perusopetuksen_opetussuunnitelman_perusteet_2014.

Richards, K. (2006). 'Being the Teacher': Identity and Classroom Conversation. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(1), 51–77.

van Lier, L. (1988). *The Classroom and the Language Learner: Ethnography and Second-Language Classroom Research*. London: Longman.

van Lier, L. (2002). An ecological–semiotic perspective on language learning and linguistics. In C. Kramsch (ed.), *Language Acquisition and Language Socialization – Ecological Perspectives* (140–164). London: Continuum.

van Lier, L. (2007). Action-Based Teaching, Autonomy and Identity. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 1*(1), 46–65.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and Language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Wragg, E. C. (1999). (Vol. 2nd ed.). *An Introduction to Classroom Observation.* London: Routledge.

Zimmerman, D. H. (1998). Discoursal and social identities. In: C: Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in Talk* (87–106). London: Sage.

Appendices

Appendix 1. *Excerpt from Descriptive Analysis (Table 1)*

- "ex. 4 – have you done it?" – "YES" says everyone in a chorus (ritual, familiar type of action + elicitation (can be replied in a short response)
- tehtävien välillä kommunikoidaan jälleen suomeksi (pupils)
- ope antaa enkuksi ohjeet mutta suomentaa ne (← voiko vaikuttaa WTC:hen? jos opettajakin usein suomentaa, voi jättää tunteen siitä että yleinen kommunikointikieli enkun tunneilla suomi?)
- "eiksun piä esittää sitä" (näyttelevät lääkäriä/potilasta) ← saivat lapun (A+B respectively) ja tekivät ohjeiden mukaan (tuttu tehtävämuoto)
- eläväisempi luokka kuin aiemmin havainnoitu → kommunikointia enemmän, myös hälinää → puhuvat keskenään AINA suomeksi lukuun ottamatta a few phrases said in a type of mocking/sarcastic tone (t.ex. "Excuse me?!"
- ovat syksyn aikana tehneet activities joissa yksi oppilas yhden tunnin aikana tulee luokan eteen kysymään kappaleen sanastoa suomeksi ja muiden oppilaiden on tarkoitus sanoa sana englanniksi (luokan edessä oleva oppilas määrää, kuka saa vastata) → viittaavat aktiivisesti (luonnollisesti lyhyitä vastauksia) (8-14 aktiivista viittaajaa 23:sta oppilaasta) ← opettaja sanoi "Who hasn't had a chance to be in the front asking?", which seems to imply that the pupils have done a similar type of exercise before and that the format is thus familiar to the pupils

Appendix 2. *Excerpt from Theoretical Analysis (Table 2)*

	What happens	WTC in the L2 (English)	WTC in the L1 (Finnish)	Notes
IT1 – conversation	- the students were instructed to discuss in English about what they had heard from a tape (a conversation between a doctor and a patient), but pupils discussed in Finnish "nii mitä tässä piti tehä" "no sillä oli pää kipiä ja silmät punaset"		x	
IT2 – telling	- teacher tells the pupils what they will do today - teacher teaches grammar		x x	- when grammar is taught, pupils do not interrupt or ask questions
IT3 – elicitation	- asks the suffixes that mark adverbs (also **IT4a**) - teacher says pupil's name and an answer is expected (allocation of turns to a specific pupil) → reply	x x		- require short replies in L2 from the pupils
IT4a – ritual	- "hard" + spreading of hands → pupils: "harder, hardest" - repeat the vocabulary list after the tape (support vocabulary)	x x		- short replies in L2 - pupils were allowed to keep vocabulary list from book open
IT4b – group work	- pupils go in the hallway for 15 min to prepare for the next task (translating a new chapter from L2 to L1)		x (but requires active reading of L2)	
Unfamiliar type of activity	- "Tehdään tämä seuraava tehtävä vähän eri tavalla" → students use Finnish - "mitä on rash?" - "sanonko mää kaikki nää sanat" "you don't have to if you don't want to" "no oon aika sekasin jo mitä oon sanonu" "okay thank you x" - "miks tää on tällanen?" - "mulla ei näy!"	x (teacher)	x (students) x x (pupil) x x	- when pupils confront a problem or unfamiliar situation, communicate in L1 - even if teacher in a new type of activity communicates in L2, pupils reply in L1
Communication with other pupils (outside activities or the topic of the	- "no alota sää" - "mitä ihmettä" - "excuse me?!" - "onkse 'I feel sick'?"	x (x)	x x x	- pupils communicate with each other in L1; apart from remarks said in a

lesson)	- talk about make-up, TV-shows between activities		x	mocking tone